

Also, a bill (H. R. 13872) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Watertown, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13873) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Winchester, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13874) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Stoneham, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13875) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wakefield, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13876) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Wakefield, Mass., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARLIN: Resolution (H. Res. 498) to pay R. T. Cook for extra services rendered in the folding room of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 380) to suspend the doing of assessment work on mining claims in Alaska for the years 1917, 1918, 1919, and 1920, and extending to that Territory the provisions of Public Resolution No. 10, Sixty-fifth Congress, approved July 17, 1917, and Public Resolution No. 12, Sixty-fifth Congress, approved October 5, 1917, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 13877) granting an increase of pension to W. W. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: A bill (H. R. 13878) granting a franking privilege to Edith Carow Roosevelt; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13879) granting a pension to Edith Carow Roosevelt; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. QUIN: A bill (H. R. 13880) granting a pension to Robert H. Neyland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHOUSE: A bill (H. R. 13881) granting an increase of pension to William Row; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WEAVER: A bill (H. R. 13882) granting a pension to John F. Ritter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOODYARD: A bill (H. R. 13883) granting an increase of pension to Joshua Westbrook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. DALE: Petition of conservation department of the Vermont State Federation of Women's Clubs, favoring proposed appropriation for the reclamation of waste lands; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EMERSON: Resolutions adopted at a meeting of Jewish citizens of Cleveland, Ohio, protesting against atrocities in Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KETTNER: Letter from William A. Manson, pertaining to revenue bill affecting jewelers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Memorial of Hon. Leon F. Moss, of Los Angeles, Cal., in the matter of Federal paved highways; to the Committee on Roads.

#### SENATE.

THURSDAY, January 9, 1919.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come before Thee to worship Thee and seek Thy blessing and Thy guidance. Thou hast dealt with us very graciously. Thou hast led us by the hand. Thou hast manifested Thyself to us in plans, purposes, ideals, and achievements that are wonderful to contemplate. We put ourselves in Thy hands to follow the divine guidance, working out all Thy great plans for us. We pray that we may be willing and obedient servants of Thine own majesty. For Christ's sake. Amen.

JAMES W. WADSWORTH, JR., a Senator from the State of New York, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday last, when, on request of Mr. SHEPARD and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

#### DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, schedules and lists of papers, forms, and so forth, not needed and of no historical value, and asking for action looking to their disposition. The communication and accompanying papers will be referred to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WEEKS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. HOLLIS] as the committee on the part of the Senate. The Secretary will notify the House of Representatives thereof.

#### COST OF THE WAR (S. DOC. NO. 329).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the United States Fuel Administrator, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 23, 1918, certain information relative to expenditures in the United States Fuel Administration to December 31, 1918, on account of the war with Germany and Austria, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### EMPLOYEES OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 331).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 23, 1918, a list showing the number of civil employees in the department January 1, 1919, and the number discharged during the previous two weeks, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### EMPLOYEES IN INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 330).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 23, 1918, a list showing the number of civil employees in the department January 1, 1919, and the number discharged during the previous two weeks, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### EMPLOYEES OF SHIPPING BOARD (S. DOC. NO. 333).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chairman of the United States Shipping Board, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 23, 1918, a list showing the number of civil employees of the board January 1, 1919, and the number discharged during the previous two weeks, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### EMPLOYEES OF FOOD ADMINISTRATION (S. DOC. NO. 332).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the United States Food Administrator, transmitting, in response to a resolution of December 23, 1918, a list showing the number of civil employees in the Food Administration January 1, 1919, and the number discharged during the previous two weeks, which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3220) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations, through the Bureau of Mines, of lignite coals and peat, to determine the practicability of their utilization as a fuel and in producing commercial products, with amendments; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 4246. An act to increase the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Connecticut;

H. R. 5989. An act to grant certain lands to the town of Olathe, Colo., for the protection of its water supply;

H. R. 8625. An act to accept from the Southern Oregon Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, a reconveyance of the lands granted to the State of Oregon by the act approved March 3, 1869, entitled "An act granting lands to the State of Oregon to aid in the construction of a military wagon road from the navigable waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg, in said State," commonly known as the Coos Bay wagon-road grant, to provide for the disposition of said lands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12210. An act to amend the act of May 14, 1898, as amended by the act of March 3, 1903, entitled "An act to ex-

tend the homestead laws and to regulate the sale and entry of public lands along the shore of navigable waters in Alaska";

H. R. 12579. An act to grant to citizens of Malheur County, Oreg., the right to cut timber in the State of Idaho for agricultural, mining, or other domestic purposes, and to remove such timber to Malheur County, Oreg.;

H. R. 12881. An act to increase the cost of the public building at Eldorado, Kans.;

H. R. 13042. An act providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Oregon under the Carey Act; and

H. R. 13306. An act to authorize the payment of allotments out of the pay of enlisted men in certain cases in which these payments have been discontinued.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MOSES presented a resolution adopted by the Central Labor Union of Portsmouth, N. H., favoring the extension of Federal control of railroads, express companies, and telephone and telegraph lines, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Council No. 195, United Commercial Travelers of America, of Manchester, N. H., praying for the return to private ownership of the railroads of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. FERNALD. I send to the desk a resolution adopted by Local Council No. 103, United Commercial Travelers of America, at a meeting held at Portland, Me. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PORTLAND COUNCIL NO. 103,  
UNITED COMMERCIAL TRAVELERS OF AMERICA,  
Portland, Me., January 6, 1919.

Hon. B. M. FERNALD,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: At the regular meeting of Portland Council of the United Commercial Travelers of America, held Saturday night, January 4, the following resolution was adopted:

"Whereas the emergency that existed making it necessary for the United States Government to take over the railroads of this country has ceased, and believing from our judgment founded on years of travel as commercial men that the people and business interests can be best served by private ownership, we ask that you, as our representative in Congress, use your best efforts to have the roads returned to their original owners under such restrictions as will be liberal and fair to them and just to the people whom they serve and whose servants they are."

A. M. MENISH, Secretary.

Mr. FERNALD. I also present a resolution adopted by Lithuanians at a mass meeting in Lewiston, Me., which I ask be placed in the RECORD without reading and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator BERT M. FERNALD,  
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

A protest resolution voted upon by the Lithuanians at a mass meeting, all parties being represented, held January 5, 1919, in Lithuanian Hall, No. 133 Lisbon Street, Lewiston, Me.

We, the Lithuanians of Lewiston and vicinity, hearing that the Polish Army threatens to take Vilna, the capital of Lithuania, met in Lithuanian Hall, January 5, 1919, and decided that:

Whereas Lithuania, since prehistoric times, embraces the Baltic coast as a separate country and nation, whose language and customs have nothing in common with those of Poland;

Whereas Lithuania having been for a long time an independent nationality and since 1772, when Russia and Germany enslaved her, Lithuanians have not ceased to fight for their rights;

And whereas this war was waged for the freeing of all nations: Therefore a great wrong would be done to the people of Lithuania if some other foreign nation would be permitted to thrust itself into Lithuania.

Protesting against the imperialistic steps of the Poles, we beseech the United States to use its influence so that this attempt of Lithuania's adversary be checked, and the Lithuanians be permitted to have their own government. We further ask the United States Government, which so generously aids other war-suffering nations, to lend a hand in behalf of the starving people of Lithuania.

LOUIS BANULIS,  
Chairman of the Committee on Resolutions.

Mr. KNOX presented resolutions adopted by the Philadelphia Bourse of Pennsylvania and resolutions adopted by the Maritime Exchange, of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the enactment of legislation for the development of the American merchant marine, which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Harrisburg, Pa., and a petition of the Home Missionary Society of Nanticoke, Pa., praying for the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution to prohibit polygamy, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the allied Irish-American Societies of Pittsburgh, Pa., and a resolution adopted at a mass meeting of sundry citizens of Sharon, Pa., in favor of freedom for Ireland, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Beaver Valley Lodge No. 607, Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, of Rochester, Pa., praying for the extension of Federal control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of sundry Lithuanian citizens of Lewiston, Me., praying for the independence of Lithuania, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of Local Council No. 103, United Commercial Travelers of America, of Portland, Me., praying for the return to private ownership of the railroads of the country, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. MYERS, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 5191) for the relief of private owners of lands within or near the Bitter Root, Lolo, or Missoula National Forests, Mont., reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 639) thereon.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. From the Committee on Military Affairs I report certain amendments intended to be proposed to the bill (S. 5261) to legalize informal or defective orders for war supplies and materials, to provide for the cancellation of orders and contracts, for the reimbursement of contractors or manufacturers, for the adjustment of claims on canceled or partially filled contracts and orders, and to provide relief for contractors pending final determination, which I ask may lie on the table and be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### MEDALS FOR THE NAVY.

Mr. SWANSON. From the Committee on Naval Affairs I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 12194) to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished-service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 638) thereon. This is a bill providing for the award of medals of honor and distinguished-service medals for those in the Navy. A bill similar to this providing for medals for the Army was passed last July, but no bill of this character has been passed for the Navy. It is very urgent that it should be passed as early as possible, as a great many of the officers and men of the Navy are being demobilized, and these honors may be properly conferred now, when it can be done more efficiently. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I should like to have the bill read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read the bill.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized to present, in the name of Congress, a medal of honor to any person who, while in the naval service of the United States, shall, in action involving actual conflict with the enemy, distinguish himself conspicuously by gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty and without detriment to the mission of his command or the command to which attached.

SEC. 2. That the President be, and he hereby is, further authorized to present, but not in the name of Congress, a distinguished-service medal of appropriate design and a ribbon, together with a rosette or other device to be worn in lieu thereof, to any person who, while in the naval service of the United States, since the 6th day of April, 1917, has distinguished, or who hereafter shall distinguish himself by exceptionally meritorious service to the Government in a duty of great responsibility.

SEC. 3. That the President be, and he hereby is, further authorized to present, but not in the name of Congress, a Navy cross of appropriate design and a ribbon, together with a rosette or other device to be worn in lieu thereof, to any person who, while in the naval service of the United States, since the 6th day of April, 1917, has distinguished, or who shall hereafter distinguish himself by extraordinary heroism or distinguished service in the line of his profession, such heroism or service not being sufficient to justify the award of a medal of honor or a distinguished-service medal.

SEC. 4. That each enlisted or enrolled person of the naval service to whom is awarded a medal of honor, distinguished-service medal, or a Navy cross shall, for each such award, be entitled to additional pay at the rate of \$2 per month from the date of the distinguished act or service on which the award is based, and each bar or other suitable emblem or insignia in lieu of a medal of honor, distinguished-service medal, or Navy cross, as hereinafter provided for, shall entitle him to further additional pay at the rate of \$2 per month from the date of the distinguished act or service for which the bar is awarded, and such additional pay shall continue throughout his active service, whether such service shall or shall not be continuous.

SEC. 5. That no more than one medal of honor or one distinguished-service medal or one Navy cross shall be issued to any one person; but for each succeeding deed or service sufficient to justify the award of a medal of honor or a distinguished-service medal or Navy cross, respectively, the President may award a suitable bar or other suitable emblem or insignia to be worn with the decoration and the corresponding rosette or other device.

SEC. 6. That the Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to expend from the appropriation "Pay of the Navy" of the Navy Department so much as may be necessary to defray the cost of the medals of



honor, distinguished service medals, and Navy crosses, and bars, emblems, or insignia herein provided for, and so much as may be necessary to replace any medals, crosses, bars, emblems, or insignia as are herein or may heretofore have been provided for: *Provided*, That such replacement shall be made only in those cases where the medal of honor, distinguished-service medal, or Navy cross, or bar, emblem, or insignia presented under the provisions of this or any other act shall have been lost, destroyed, or rendered unfit for use without fault or neglect on the part of the person to whom it was awarded, and shall be made without charge therefor.

SEC. 7. That, except as otherwise prescribed herein, no medal of honor, distinguished-service medal, Navy cross, or bar or other suitable emblem or insignia in lieu of either of said medals or of said cross shall be issued to any person after more than five years from the date of the act or service justifying the award thereof, nor unless a specific statement or report distinctly setting forth the act or distinguished service and suggesting or recommending official recognition thereof shall have been made by his naval superior through official channels at the time of the act or service or within three years thereafter.

SEC. 8. That in case an individual who shall distinguish himself dies before the making of the award to which he may be entitled the award may nevertheless be made and the medal or cross or the bar or other emblem or insignia presented within five years from the date of the act or service justifying the award thereof to such representative of the deceased as the President may designate: *Provided*, That no medal or cross or no bar or other emblem or insignia shall be awarded or presented to any individual or to the representative of any individual whose entire service subsequent to the time he distinguished himself shall not have been honorable: *Provided further*, That in cases of persons now in the naval service for whom the award of the medal of honor has been recommended in full compliance with then existing regulations, but on account of services which, though insufficient fully to justify the award of the distinguished-service medal or Navy cross hereinbefore provided for, such cases may be considered and acted upon under the provisions of this act authorizing the award of the distinguished-service medal and Navy cross, notwithstanding that said services may have been rendered more than five years before said cases shall have been considered as authorized by this proviso, but all consideration or any action upon any of said cases shall be based exclusively upon official records now on file in the Navy Department.

SEC. 9. That the President be, and he hereby is, authorized to delegate, under such conditions, regulations, and limitations as he shall prescribe, to flag officers who are commanders in chief or commanding on important independent duty the power conferred upon him by this act to award the Navy cross; and he is further authorized to make from time to time any and all rules, regulations, and orders which he shall deem necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act and to execute the full purpose and intention thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JONES of Washington. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee a question. I notice that the bill provides for some increase of pay. Was there a corresponding provision in the military act?

Mr. SWANSON. I understand there is practically the same provision in both the military and naval bills for the increase of pay of enlisted men who receive the medals.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I do not remember that there was any increased pay provided for those in the Army.

Mr. SWANSON. I inquired at the Navy Department, and they assured me that it is true.

Mr. JONES of Washington. If this corresponds with the military bill, I do not object.

Mr. SWANSON. I understand it does. I did not look up the matter specifically myself, but I made inquiry at the Bureau of Navigation, that had charge of the preparation of the bill, and they stated that there was practically the same increase allowed in the Army.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator says "practically the same." Is it the same or is there a difference?

Mr. SWANSON. There is a little difference in pay between the Army and Navy.

Mr. JONES of Washington. What I have in mind is that this bill provides for the payment of \$2 a month additional.

Mr. SWANSON. Two dollars, and I understand in the Army the enlisted men get \$2.

Mr. JONES of Washington. That is what I wanted to know. I have no objection then to the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. SUTHERLAND. I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs why the first section of the bill is different in language from the following section in that it provides for men in future and not those who have already distinguished themselves in action.

Mr. SWANSON. The other sections of the bill provide that these medals shall be bestowed upon anyone who has done service that justify the awarding of the medal since the 6th of April, 1916, since the declaration of war was made. Outside of the congressional medals I understand that there is a law authorizing the awarding of medals and crosses. The other section of the bill as passed by the House authorizes these medals to be awarded in the future to anyone in actual service subsequent to the 6th of April, 1916.

Mr. KIRBY. I did not hear the bill read and I do not know anything about it. Does it only provide for the awarding of medals. Is that the purpose of the bill?

Mr. SWANSON. That is the purpose of it.

Mr. KIRBY. It does not increase the rank of anyone?

Mr. SWANSON. It does not increase the rank of anyone.

Mr. KIRBY. Nor the pay of anyone in the Navy?

Mr. SWANSON. No; except that the enlisted men who get these medals awarded have an increase of \$2 a month in their pay.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### COURTS IN OKLAHOMA.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report back favorably without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 208) providing that one term of the United States district court for the eastern judicial district of Oklahoma shall be held annually at Hugo, Okla. I ask the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] to the joint resolution.

Mr. GORE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution. It is purely a local matter.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and it was read, as follows:

*Resolved, etc.*, That one term of the United States district court for the eastern district of Oklahoma shall be held each year on the second Monday in May at Hugo, in said State and district, and all acts and parts of acts not in accordance herewith are hereby modified in accordance with the provisions of this act.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### LANDS IN MINNESOTA.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, referring to the bill (H. R. 79) for the sale of isolated tracts of the public domain in Minnesota, which I explained to the Senate the other day, I desire to say that the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] then desired time to look into the bill. I understand he has stated that he has now no objection to the bill. A bill similar to this once passed the Senate, and the bill for which I now ask consideration has passed the House. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be brought before the Senate for consideration and passage at this time.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Minnesota that I have examined the bill, and, as it only affects a few isolated tracts of land in the State of Minnesota, I have no objection to its consideration and passage at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will state to the Senator from Minnesota that the bill has not been reported to the Senate.

Mr. KELLOGG. I introduced such a bill the other day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes; but the bill is at present in the hands of the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. KELLOGG. Then I shall have to secure a report from that committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota can move to discharge the Committee on Public Lands from the further consideration of the bill.

Mr. KELLOGG. I move that the Committee on Public Lands be discharged from the further consideration of the bill, and that it may now be considered by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Minnesota moves that the Committee on Public Lands be discharged from the further consideration of the bill the title of which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 79) for the sale of isolated tracts of the public domain in Minnesota.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota state what reason there is why the Committee on Public Lands should be discharged from the consideration of the bill?

Mr. KELLOGG. The Committee on Public Lands has considered a bill exactly like this one and has reported it favorably. That bill passed the Senate; but instead of the other House taking up the particular bill which passed the Senate, it took up the House bill, passed it, and sent it over here. The two bills are identical, and I simply ask that this bill be taken up and passed.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, there has been so much noise in the Chamber that I could not hear the statement of the Senator from Minnesota. I will ask the Senator to again state his request.

Mr. KELLOGG. I desire to state, in reply to the inquiry of the Senator from Montana, that the Committee on Public Lands once considered a bill similar to the one for which I now ask consideration, and recommended its passage. The bill simply provides for the application of the general statute providing for the sale of isolated tracts of an Indian reservation of the Chippewas in the State of Minnesota, the sale of such lands having been heretofore provided for by other laws.

Mr. MYERS. I thank the Senator for his explanation.

Mr. KELLOGG. As I have stated, the Senate has passed a similar bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Committee on Public Lands is discharged from the further consideration of the bill and the question is, on the request of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], for unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the provisions of section 2455 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by the act of March 28, 1912 (37 Stat. L., 77), relating to the sale of isolated tracts of the public domain, be, and the same are hereby, extended and made applicable to ceded Chippewa Indian lands in the State of Minnesota: *Provided*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to lands which are not subject to homestead entry: *Provided further*, That purchasers of land under this act must pay for the lands not less than the price fixed in the law opening the lands to homestead entry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### LANDS IN MISSOULA COUNTY, MONT.

Mr. MYERS. I report from the Committee on Public Lands favorably and without amendment the bill (H. R. 9865) to authorize the sale of certain lands to school district No. 28 of Missoula County, Mont., and I submit a report (No. 637) thereon.

I desire to say a few words in explanation of the bill. The bill has passed the House and has come over to the Senate and is now favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Public Lands. The act opening the Flathead Reservation in Montana provided for the sale of a 10-acre tract of land to the town of Ronan, Mont., for school purposes, at not less than the appraised value, the funds to go to the Flathead Indians. The town of Ronan, however, is not the proper entity to which to convey the land. The conveyance should be to school district No. 28, of Missoula County, Mont., which should be the holder of title to the land. Under the laws of the State of Montana, the conveyance should be made to the school district. It is the district in which the town of Ronan is situated, but towns do not own land for school purposes in my State. This bill is merely to correct that error and to substitute school district No. 28, of Missoula County, Mont., for the town of Ronan. It will enable the 10-acre tract of land to be sold by the Secretary of the Interior, at not less than the appraised value, to school district No. 28, of Missoula County, Mont. The Interior Department urges that it be done. As I have already stated, the money is to go to the Indians, and Indian children are permitted to attend the school. So there is no objection whatever to the legislation. The Interior Department urges that the legislation be enacted promptly. In fact, a school building has already been erected on the land, on the supposition that the title to it would be made all right. I therefore report the bill and ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized, in his discretion, to sell and convey to school district No. 28, of Missoula County, Mont., the southwest quarter of the southwest quarter of the southeast quarter of section 36, township 21 north, range 20 west, on the Flathead Indian Reservation, in Montana, or so much thereof as may be required, for public-school purposes, under such terms and regulations as he may prescribe, at not less than its appraised value; and the net proceeds from the sale of said land shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the Flathead Indians, to draw interest at the rate now provided by law, and to be used for the benefit of the Indians on the Flathead Indian Reservation: *Provided*, That the patent therefor shall contain the condition that Indian children residing in the said school district No. 28 shall at all times be admitted to the privilege of attendance and instruction on equality with white children.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL RESERVE ACT.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I report favorably, with amendments, from the Committee on Banking and Currency the bill (S. 5236) to amend sections 7, 10, and 11 of the Federal reserve act, and section 5172, Revised Statutes of the United States, and I submit a report (No. 636) thereon.

I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill, the passage of which is urgently requested by the Federal Reserve Board. The committee has stricken from the bill some of the provisions which were asked for, so that the bill now only contains provisions which cover the following purposes:

First, to permit the Federal reserve banks to use their earnings and to increase their surplus until the surplus amounts

to 100 per cent. The present law limits the surplus to 40 per cent, and that amount has almost been already reached.

The reason for desiring that the surplus may be increased is that the deposits of these banks have grown very largely, and also the note issues of the banks have grown, on account of the war very much beyond what had been anticipated, so that at the present time the Federal reserve banks of the United States have capital and surplus amounting only to 2 per cent of their total liabilities. This condition places them in an awkward position, particularly so far as any foreign relations are concerned. For instance, the Federal Reserve Bank of New York City has a capital of only \$20,000,000. I do not remember exactly what its surplus amounts to, but it may amount to four million or five million dollars. It has, however, a capital of only twenty million. It has obligations greater than has the Bank of England, and yet the Bank of England has four times the capital of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York City. Therefore the Federal Reserve Board desires that these banks may be allowed to use surplus earnings year by year, including the year 1918 just passed—and that is the urgency of it—until the surplus aggregates 100 per cent.

I wish to say further that under the present law the surplus earnings, after the payment of 6 per cent dividends, are divided into two parts—one-half goes to creating additional surplus, which, however, is limited to 40 per cent, and the other part goes into the Treasury of the United States as a franchise tax, where it is used as a special fund either for the purchase of bonds or as a redemption fund for notes. It is an unimportant and unnecessary disposition of the money for that purpose, but if we are to have the Federal Reserve Banking System strong and to compare with the other great reserve banks of the world we certainly want a capital and surplus greater than 2 per cent.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. GRONNA. I think it was understood that the third provision had relation to the engraving of signatures on notes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am coming to that presently, if the Senator will wait.

Mr. GRONNA. Very well; but while I am on my feet, I wish to ask the Senator, who is acting chairman of the committee, if he is quite sure that the only change that this provision makes in existing law relates simply to the engraving of signatures on the notes? There was some question in regard to that.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I can take that matter up now. The committee in ordering the report of the bill qualified it by saying that, as acting chairman of the committee, I must first assure myself that the third provision, which I have not read yet, related only to authorizing the use of engraved signatures and did not include anything else. That section is a reenactment of existing law, but the committee was not able to follow it out to the full extent. I telephoned to Gov. Harding, of the Federal Reserve Board, and asked him for a written statement on that point. I received his reply this morning—my colleague from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who raised the point, has the letter—a reading of which convinces me that the provision changes the law in no respect except authorizing the engraving of the signatures on the notes instead of the names being signed, and it omits the authorization for \$3 notes from the law, that provision being a dead letter. The Senator can see that letter if he so desires.

The other provision, which the committee reports favorably, provides for enlarging the amount of notes of any one customer that a Federal reserve bank can discount for a member bank. As the law is now a Federal reserve bank can only discount for a member bank notes of an individual customer of the member bank to the extent of 10 per cent of its capital and surplus; that is, if John Smith goes to a member bank, say a State bank, and discounts notes or borrows money to the extent of 20 per cent of the capital and surplus of the bank, that bank can only use one-half of those notes at the Federal reserve bank. This provision authorizes the Federal Reserve Board from time to time, by a general ruling covering all the districts, to permit the Federal reserve banks to discount for any member bank notes to the extent of 20 per cent of their capital and surplus for any one customer, provided United States bonds, in addition to the other securities, are deposited with the notes and bills so discounted.

The purpose of this is double—to facilitate the discount of notes and to afford an additional use for United States securities. The committee, on the motion, I think, of my colleague from Nebraska, struck out the provision which limited those securities to United States bonds issued during the recent war and provided that any United States bonds might be used as such security.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—



Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. This seems to be another step in the program of inflation.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, Mr. President, I doubt that. I think it gives additional value to United States bonds. Where men have purchased in the stress of the war more bonds than they really were able to buy, it enables them to borrow money at their own banks, and it permits home banks to use those bonds as security if they wish to discount notes at the Federal reserve banks. It can only be done, however, in those cases where the Federal reserve bank authorizes it for all of the districts of the country.

I will say to the Senator from Idaho that I have stood strenuously in the committee against the repeated attempts that have been made to remove that limitation on borrowing. I believe that the banks ought not to be allowed to increase the amount of money they can loan to any one customer; but we have taken into the system a great many State banks, and under the State laws those banks are authorized in many cases to loan 20 per cent of their capital and surplus to a single customer on certain classes of security. So I yielded my judgment on this provision, and think no harm can come from it. It is in the direction of extending the credit of the Government; it is in the direction of maintaining the value of the liberty bonds that the people have in many cases been forced to buy.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska yield to me?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, there may be a few States in the Union that authorize the loaning of 20 per cent of the capital and surplus of a bank to one individual, but I can not recall a State that authorizes it. Generally the limit is 10 per cent, although in many cases it is 15 per cent, but 15 per cent is always considered rather extravagant.

Under this provision we authorize 20 per cent of the capital and surplus of a bank to be loaned to a single individual and the Federal Reserve Board to issue notes on the full face value, provided there are United States bonds back of them. States requiring by law that no larger amount than 10 per cent of capital and surplus shall be loaned to an individual can receive no benefit under this provision, if it should pass. It seems to me that it will simply give to a State that has authorized a loan amounting to 20 per cent of the capital and surplus to one individual an advantage over the State which has been conservative in the past in holding down extremely large loans to single individuals. On the face of it, Mr. President, I do not like it. There may be some special reason for it about which I am not informed, but I wish to say to the Senator now that from a casual reading of the bill I think it is very poor banking policy.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President, referring to the amount which the banks may loan upon the security of Government bonds, my understanding is that in all the debates and discussions we have had in the last few months in regard to this matter we have stated that we wished to uphold and strengthen the position of the liberty bonds. Now, whether that is so or not may be a matter of debate. I am willing, however, to vote to allow banks in the Federal Reserve System to loan 20 per cent of their capital and surplus on liberty bonds. We must understand that to-day 2 per cent bonds, under the advantages given them, sell at 98 cents on the dollar, almost par, while poor people who have been urged to buy liberty bonds are compelled to accept 94, 96, and 98 cents on the dollar. I sincerely believe that we ought not to increase the amount which may be loaned on bonds by the amendment on lines 16, 17, 18, and 19 on page 3. I should like to have the Senator give me some information on that point.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, of course my request now is only for unanimous consent to consider the bill. When consent is given, it will be for the Senate to decide whether it will strike out that portion which is recommended by the committee giving preference to liberty bonds.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the statement made by the Senator from Vermont, I am afraid, will be misunderstood. This provision is not to enable loans to be made upon liberty bonds, but to enable loans to be made upon the paper of an individual who may borrow from the banks with an amount of liberty bonds to the face of the loan as security. That is what this provision is for. It is not a loan upon liberty bonds at all.

What I object to is this: I believe it is unwise and unsafe banking to allow banks in the United States to loan 20 per cent of their capital and surplus to any one individual or any one corporation. I make that as a broad statement, and I believe

it is unsound to establish that principle. I think 10 per cent is safe, and in certain cases I am perfectly willing to say that it might be 15 per cent, just as many of the State laws have provided; but when it comes to saying that 20 per cent, one-fifth of all the capital and all the surplus of a bank, can be loaned to one individual, I say it is a poor business policy.

Mr. PAGE. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. PAGE. I should like to have the Senator leave us clear about this matter. He says that under this provision 20 per cent of a bank's capital and surplus can be loaned to one individual.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. PAGE. I do not understand that this percentage may be loaned to anyone except on security of Government bonds.

Mr. SMOOT. Back of the loan that is made by the bank there are to be these liberty bonds, or under the provisions of this bill any other United States bonds can be held by the Federal Reserve Board as security for the payment of the loan. That is all this bill provides.

Mr. PAGE. But it really means that we are loaning on Government bonds, does it not?

Mr. SMOOT. Oh, no, Mr. President; we are virtually loaning to the bank. The transaction has to originate in the bank, and then the bank must have a similar amount in liberty bonds as additional security. That is all there is to it. It is authorizing the bonds to be deposited as security for the loan.

Mr. PAGE. But it is really an inhibition against loaning money to anybody up to the amount of 20 per cent unless there are Government bonds behind the transaction.

Mr. SMOOT. Of course, I think the Federal Reserve Board will see to that. I am not objecting to that. I think these bonds are the very best security. There could not be better security. What I am objecting to is the unsound business policy of allowing a bank to loan one-fifth of its capital and surplus to one individual.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator by whom this legislation is recommended. Is it recommended by the Federal Reserve Board?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It is recommended by the Federal Reserve Board, and it is rather an urgent matter, not only because they want to have it apply to the surplus which has been accumulated during the year 1918 but because they want to give relief to those people who, under stress of great agitation, have gone to their banks and borrowed money to purchase United States liberty bonds. They do not want those people compelled to throw those bonds upon the market and sell them. They want to permit them, under regulations of the board, to use them as security for maintaining their loans.

Mr. SWANSON. Is any limit contained in the bill as to the time in which this can be done? Is any limited number of years prescribed?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; but it is provided that upon the affirmative vote of not less than five of its members the Federal Reserve Board shall have power from time to time, by general ruling covering all districts alike, "to permit Federal reserve banks to discount for any member bank," and so forth. It is a temporary matter, to be used when it is necessary to relieve the country on account of the purchase of these bonds.

Mr. SMOOT. I want to say this further to the Senator: This would never affect an individual who had not bought more bonds than one-fifth of the capital and surplus of the bank upon which the loan could be made; and, Mr. President, the policy has always been for a bank to accommodate not merely one person in the community in which it is located, but to accommodate all of the people in that community, and therefore the law has justly held that it was unwise to allow a bank to loan more than 10 per cent of its capital and surplus to any one person. As I said, however, in some instances the limit has reached as high as 15 per cent. That is the principle involved in this proposition that I do not like.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I should like to make this suggestion to the Senator—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What the Senator from Virginia says is very true. It is only intended as a temporary expedient from time to time, when by the affirmative vote of five members of the board it is deemed desirable to do it. It will only be a temporary matter.

Mr. SWANSON. At the present time, when people all over the country have bought bonds with the understanding that their loans would be renewed by the banks two or three times before payment would be required—and, of course, they made the purchases largely on borrowed money, and a great many of these notes were discounted by the Federal reserve banks—I can see where there is necessity for legislation to prevent peo-

ple who thus bought bonds from having to sacrifice them; but it does seem to me to be inconsistent with the principles of sane banking to allow for a long time to come—for years to come—big borrowers to get 20 per cent of all the capital and surplus of a bank; to allow, for years and years to come, big borrowers to absorb all the money in the market and let the small manufacturers and merchants and people conducting other enterprises be debarred from borrowing. That is legislation that I think ought to be avoided.

It seems to me that if we should limit this to a certain length of time, so as to get rid of the present conditions in connection with the sale of liberty bonds, it would be wise; but to have a law passed under which for all time five or six big borrowers in any community can take the resources of a bank and absorb them and small borrowers will have no opportunity to go there and get their notes discounted would be unwise legislation. It seems to me that the committee ought to limit this to meet the present emergency.

One of the great advantages of the Federal Reserve System to the entire country was the fact that it limited loans to 10 per cent. Nobody could get in excess of 10 per cent of the capital and surplus of a bank; so the money was in the bank, and small manufacturers and merchants and the masses of the people, this fund being unabsorbed by large borrowers, were able to get bank accommodations. I can see that the Senator is right in saying that something ought to be done to relieve this emergency; but I should like to see the legislation limited to a certain number of years during which this privilege can be extended.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Personally I am disposed to agree with that view of the case. I will say to the Senator that I have made, not once but repeatedly, fights in the committee to oppose the modification of the law limiting individual loans to 10 per cent; and personally I should be glad to support the proposition of a three-year limit.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that this provision is going to apply to only a very few people in the United States. If a bank's capital and surplus is a million dollars, 20 per cent of that is \$200,000. Fifteen per cent, under the laws of the States now, is \$150,000; and there are very few people in the United States who have bought \$150,000 worth of liberty bonds and borrowed money to carry them.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, this emergency has arisen: A manufacturer or a merchant needs so much money to conduct his business. Heretofore he has been doing it under the 10 per cent limitation of the Federal reserve act. But these manufacturers and merchants and people who have bought these bonds not only have to take care of their business now, but they have to take care of the bonds until they can be paid for. Consequently under those circumstances they might need 20 per cent now to take care of their business and to prevent the sale of these bonds. It seems to me that if we should limit this provision to two years or three years we would get rid of this emergency, and we would not have a law here that could be used for the next 20 years to give the entire resources of a bank into the hands of a few of these big borrowers.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I am going to ask the Senator if he will not allow this bill to go over. If it is absolutely necessary to have legislation of this kind I am not going to object; but I really believe it would be better for the United States, in the few cases that will be affected by this bill, to compel the borrowers, if necessary, to sell their bonds upon the market rather than to have put upon the statute books here a provision stating that 20 per cent of the capital and surplus of a bank can be loaned to one individual.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. I am not going to oppose the consideration of this bill at the present time, but I want to make my position clear to the Senate.

I am in favor of the first section of the bill, which provides for the increase of the capital of the reserve banks, because I realize that one of the criticisms of this system was that probably we did not provide a sufficient capital for the Federal reserve banks at the time the legislation was enacted, and I think that appeals with a very great deal of force to foreign banking interests; but I am unalterably opposed to the second section of the bill. I do not think this country is interested in having some one get off of the Federal Reserve Board and immediately get into one of these member banks, and I am opposed to it.

As to the third proposition, the effect of it is going to be this: It is going to encourage the loaning of all the deposits of member banks to five borrowers. That is what it means; and I will never give my consent to that provision.

It is true that some reference is made here to the bond market, to the effect that we want to increase the use of these bonds. Of course, I am in harmony with that; but if one of these member banks has a large number of Government bonds it is not necessary for that bank to go to a regional reserve bank in order to use those bonds. It can either go out in the market and sell them, or it can go to other banks and get accommodations there with that security. I can never give my consent to a proposition which means that any bank can invite deposits from all of the community, and then loan out all of these deposits to five men. It is vicious banking; and while I have the profoundest respect for the Federal Reserve Board, I never can give my consent to a modification of the law which will permit that method of banking.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Senator is mistaken in saying that it is proposed to allow any bank to loan out all of its deposits to five men.

Mr. POMERENE. No, Mr. President; I simply said that it encourages that proposition. That was my statement.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It may have only \$100,000 capital and it may have \$1,000,000 of deposits. If it loans \$20,000 to each of five men, it has only loaned \$100,000, and it still has \$900,000 to loan, or at least it has several hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. POMERENE. I do think that to that extent my statement should be corrected.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But at the present time all I am asking for is the immediate consideration of the bill; and if the Senate wants to adopt only the first provision I am willing to submit to that by a simple vote, without any discussion, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I do not want to go that far; but I do want the Senator to let the bill go over, and then I want a little time to study it more than I have in the casual reading of it to-day. So far as the Senator from Nebraska is concerned, he can bring it up to-morrow.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Unfortunately, the Senator from Nebraska can not do that. He is leaving town to-night; and the board is very urgent about this, because the surplus earnings of 1918 are the ones as to which Congress has got to say now, or very soon, what shall be done with them.

Mr. SMOOT. I am perfectly willing to vote for the enactment of that provision, because it tends toward safety. Nobody will object to that. If the balance of the bill is stricken out, as far as I am concerned, it can pass right now—I mean with only that one provision in it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Have the Senators agreed on what shall pass?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not know that that can be done very well by unanimous consent.

Mr. SMOOT. The safest way is to let the bill go over. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

#### THE COAL SITUATION.

Mr. SMOOT. From the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I report back favorably without amendment Senate resolution 405, submitted by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] on the 3d instant, and I ask for its immediate consideration. I will say that it will not lead to any discussion.

The resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That S. Res. 374, instructing the Committee on Manufactures to make inquiry into the coal situation, its production, transportation, and consumption, to require the attendance of necessary witnesses, the production of books, documents, and papers, etc., be, and it hereby is, amended so as to authorize the employment of counsel to assist in the inquiry aforesaid.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED.

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 5306) to recognize the patriotic services of members of the district and local draft boards of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 5307) for the relief of the Red Wing Brewing Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 5308) for the relief of the Eastern Transportation Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRIS:

A bill (S. 5309) granting a pension to Erastus A. Buck; to the Committee on Pensions.



By Mr. LA FOLLETTE:

A bill (S. 5310) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Hahn (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 5311) granting an increase of pension to Henry L. Bannow; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX:

A bill (S. 5312) to donate a piece of field artillery to Girard College, of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 5313) authorizing the Secretary of War to acquire and maintain a cemetery in France in the name of the United States for the reception and interment of the bodies of American officers and men who lost their lives in connection with the European war, and to appropriate \$500,000 therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. FLETCHER:

A bill (S. 5315) authorizing the Secretary of War to deliver one cannon to the city of Orlando, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 5316) granting the consent of Congress to Wenatchee-Beebe Orchard Co. to construct a bridge across the Columbia River at or within 4 miles northerly from the town of Chelan Falls, in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Commerce.

#### REPEAL OF ESPIONAGE ACT.

Mr. FRANCE. I introduce a bill and give notice that at the close of the morning business to-day I shall ask to submit some brief observations upon it.

The bill (S. 5314) to repeal "An act to punish acts of interference with the foreign relations, the neutrality, and the foreign commerce of the United States, to punish espionage, and better to enforce the criminal laws of the United States, and for other purposes," and the act amendatory thereof, was read twice by its title.

#### THE GREEK SITUATION.

Mr. GRONNA. I present resolutions from a Greek association. They are brief, and I ask that they may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### AN IMMEDIATE APPEAL TO AMERICA BY THE PEOPLE OF GREECE.

To whom it may concern:

In view of President Wilson's principle of "self-determination," as enunciated by him in his desire to see justice established in a free world, the people of Greece, as well as the 3,000,000 unredeemed Greeks now under Turkish and Bulgarian rule, feel that the people of America will take a special interest in the danger which threatens the just cause of Hellenism through the continued German and Bulgarian influence, which is still being exerted and always will be, in some form or another, unless the present favorable opportunity is seized of checking once and for all this evil tendency.

Up to the present time, owing to the lack of communications, very little information has apparently reached this country with regard to the heroic part played by the Greek Army in the military operations which led to the complete defeat of the Bulgarian forces on the Balkan front. And yet, it should be borne in mind that it was the mobilization and actual presence on the front of the Greek Army which rendered the general offensive on the Balkan front possible, while, on the other hand, the excellent conduct of the Greek soldiers, their bravery and discipline, their surprising rapidity in attack and pursuit, and, generally, their first-rate military qualities, have repeatedly been the object of unstinted praise and admiration on the part of the commanding French and British generals, who did not hesitate to assign to the Greek Army an important share in the final victory.

Of the hardships and sufferings endured by the Greeks under Bulgarian rule, and for centuries under Turkish tyranny, there is, of course, much to be said. Their history is just one long reign of terror, a good idea of which can be gained from Mr. Ward Price's dispatch to the New York Times, which has thrown a flood of vivid light on what has hitherto been willfully shrouded in darkness, and has revealed to the world at large the truth about the inhuman savagery of the Bulgarians. As the Times editorial of November 20 aptly says: "It is a horrible story, but Americans may read it with profit." Certainly, when the whole truth becomes known, the American people will realize that the fate of the inhabitants of Belgium and northern France during these last four years of German occupation has in no way been more terrible than that of the Greeks under Bulgarian and Turkish rule.

Abandoned by indifferent Europe in 1453, in the face of overwhelming Turkish hordes, the enslaved Greeks of the Ottoman Empire, in whose native language the gospels and epistles of St. Paul were written, still remain to-day the sole bulwark of the Christian faith in the East, while their achievements, under the most adverse conditions, in commerce, science, and all intellectual spheres, are such as to warrant unlimited faith in their rapid development, when the shackles of tyranny are lifted. To quote from a letter written by President Wilson to Mr. Frank W. Jackson, chairman of the relief committee for the Greeks of Asia Minor: "Their steadfast allegiance to their Christian faith in the face of every inducement and threat to abandon it, commends them most strongly to all who believe in the principles of religious freedom, and their adherence to the ideals of constitutional government should make them peculiarly the object of the cordial sympathy of the American people, the foundation stones of whose political structure are freedom and liberty."

Now, that the supreme moment is at hand, when, at the peace table, the fate of Hellenism will be decided, enemy influences are being exerted to mislead the American people and to circumvent the rules laid down

by President Wilson, whereby all people should be free to determine for themselves their own existence. Therefore we say, let the American people be on their guard and, with wise discrimination, pluck forth this poisonous weed and in its place sow the seeds of everlasting love and gratitude, that will unite forever the people whose ancestors more than 2,000 years ago first established and used this Greek word "democracy," and the great free Nation of the New World, which has carried the old idea to its present perfection.

All we ask for is justice, the return to their motherland of the following unredeemed Greek regions:

1. Epirus, including Himara, Korytza, Kastoria.
2. Macedonia, including the purely Greek towns of Xanthi and Dedagatch.
3. Thrace, including Constantinople and the country surrounding the sea of Marmara.
4. Asia Minor, Smyrna, and the contiguous territories, inhabited by nearly 2,000,000 Greeks.
5. The islands of the Dodecanese, which are inhabited only by Greeks, with the exception of 11,000 Turks in Rhodes and Cos and 4,000 Jews in Rhodes.

In thus pointing to the injustice so long endured by Greece we appeal to the American people to make use of every constitutional means at their disposal in order that the glorious deed of restitution should be accomplished; we appeal to them to make their wishes known to their Representatives in Congress, both by letter and telegram, so that the principles upheld by their President should be vindicated the whole world over and become an article of faith for regenerated mankind when the Prince of Peace shall have come into His own.

JOHN N. METAXA,  
Former Governor of Salonika, Greece.

#### REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA.

Mr. MOSES. I present an address presented to the President of the United States by the President of the Senate of Costa Rica, and I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECRETARY OF THE CONGRESS,  
SAN JOSE OF COSTA RICA, 21 November, 1918.

HIS EXCELLENCY PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Washington:

In fulfillment of the resolution that was unanimously, by acclamation, adopted by the Senate and Chamber of Deputies of this Republic, at the session of the 19th instant, and as an interpretation and manifest spirit of that resolution, we have the honor to address the following communication to your excellency, by wireless telegraphy, whilst a formal transcription thereof is proceeding by mail:

"Upon the proclamation, through the illustrious medium of your excellency, of the very beautiful program of ideals for men, for nations, and for humanity, the United States of America entered upon the gigantic conflict of the world war, originally provoked in defense of the rights of small nationalities.

"Adopting those beautiful ideals, and acting through a lofty sentiment of continental solidarity, the little Republic of Costa Rica, through the medium of its constitutionally organized powers, declared a state of war to exist between it and the German Empire, in order thus to profess its profound sympathy and unconditional support of the doctrines proclaimed by the allied nations—this being the extent to which, because of its size and the meagerness of its means of war, Costa Rica could aid.

"Costa Rica to-day celebrates with the greatest enthusiasm the favorable outcome of the war and, with the most sincere rejoicing, the triumph of the doctrines proclaimed by your excellency and by the American armies gloriously established upon the fields of battle.

"Your idea of the league of nations is firmly grounded on nature considered as a social factor and is altogether an indispensable complement to the establishment of the loyal and enduring peace throughout the world.

"Such a peace you have admirably planned to found upon three immovable bases; the right of peoples to freely govern themselves; the right of nations to freely control their destinies; and the right of humanity to freely pursue the course of its perfection.

"Your conception works for redemption and for this reason, chiefly, Costa Rica, fully aware of the consequences, did not hesitate to align itself by the side of her great sister whose destiny so brilliantly directed in this awful conflict, must be the betterment of humanity.

"In these memorable moments in which your excellency raises on high the standard of humanity this small country ventures to acclaim the fact of its devotion to that standard, because the fundamental principles which you have written upon that banner have been at all times adhered to by the Republic of Costa Rica; its people now and always have freely chosen its governors; as a nation it has always been able to maintain its sovereignty with dignity and prestige; as an integral part of the world it has never placed obstacles in the way of others, but, on the contrary, it has contributed, within the small means at its disposal, to the progressive march of humanity.

"Costa Rica, through the medium of its legally constituted representatives, expresses the hope that your excellency will accord to our Government the place in the family of sovereign nations to which it is entitled, for Costa Rica has always respected the rights of peoples, of nations, and of humanity.

"To this end the Senate and Chamber of Deputies has authorized us, under the circumstances, to respectfully inform Your Excellency and the Congress of the United States of North America that the Government of Senor don Federico A. Tinoco, as well as all powers instituted thereunder, are constituted by the suffrage of the Costa Rican people, convoked in free election, extended to all the peoples by which said Government, as well as all constituted authorities, exercise their functions; that the Government of Senor Tinoco, as well as the legislative and judicial powers of this Republic, are not only founded upon incontestable legality but legally exercise their functions and for that reason are justly entitled to look for recognition by other States.

"The investiture of President Tinoco and other members of the legislative and judicial powers with their respective authority is based upon the suffrage and the fundamental law.

"Such, then, is the correct aspect in which the political situation of the Republic should be viewed, and it is respectfully brought to Your Excellency's attention in order to realize the aspiration of the Costa Rican people which the Congress has embodied in the resolution. It justly claims the honor and the benefit of recognition on the part of nations that so far have not deigned to favor this country with official

relations, and for that reason the legislative bodies hope that such desire will be favorably considered by Your Excellency, who is the apostle of equality and liberty of nations, and who has made his apostolicaly felt in a form that will be preserved ever after in history."

We are Your Excellency's most respectful servants,

DR. RAFAEL CALDERON MUÑOZ,  
President of the Senate.  
LIC. FRANCISCO FAERON,  
President of the Chamber of Deputies.  
RICARDO COTO FERNANDEZ,  
DR. FRANCISCO A. SEGURA,  
Secretaries of the Senate.  
JULIO ESQUIVEL,  
FRANKLIN JIMÉNEZ,  
Secretaries of the Chamber of Deputies.

#### INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.

Mr. GRONNA. I present a sort of a brief entitled "Reciprocal Representation in the World's Assembly and International Bonding Remedies against Recurrence of War," by Emil G. Beck, M. D., of Chicago, Ill. It contains, I think, some very useful suggestions, and while I do not want to say that I either approve it or disapprove it, I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### RECIPROCAL REPRESENTATION IN A WORLD'S ASSEMBLY AND INTERNATIONAL BONDING REMEDIES AGAINST RECURRENCE OF WAR.

[By Emil G. Beck, M. D., Chicago, Ill.]

##### The essential points:

A. An international legislative body, with judicial powers, chosen by reciprocal method: Each nation to send at least seven representatives, but instead of choosing all members from its own citizens each nation to select two from its own country and one from each of five foreign countries. This reciprocal method of choosing representatives will form an extraordinary assemblage of statesmen who will form a very impartial world's parliament and not likely to form cliques.

B. All nations to enter into a universal alliance treaty (bond) which contains the provisions against hostilities between nations and which is secured by heavy bonds of the cosigners—bonds not their own issue.

C. A suggestion for the formation and economical upkeep of an international army (reciprocal) which in peace times serves as a national police and serves part time in foreign countries.

In his epoch-making address of January 22, 1917, President Wilson said:

"In every discussion of the peace that must end this war it is taken for granted that the peace must be given by some definite concert of power which will make it virtually impossible that any such catastrophe should ever overwhelm us again. Every lover of mankind, every sane and thoughtful man, must take that for granted."

This lofty declaration of our President, no doubt, voices the most intense desire and sentiment of every well-meaning person. The only excuse for a repetition of this terrible catastrophe would be the failure of the nations to devise a plan by which future wars would be made impossible.

The world's greatest statesmen and political economists are now at work devising plans by which a fraternity among all nations may be maintained, of which the league of nations stands foremost. In the upheaval and chaos which exist at present the task is most difficult, but they have already defined the principles on the bases of which the problem will be worked out.

The main obstacle to a lasting peace is the fact that it is almost impossible to secure a court of arbitration which would be regarded by all nations as absolutely impartial. It lacks in one essential, namely: It does not provide against the possible danger of combinations by the representatives from the different countries who, in deciding matters of vital interest, might cast the weight of their votes to that country to which they owe allegiance. A nation is not willing to submit its case for arbitration to a body of judges unless they are convinced that in the hands of these judges its interests would be safeguarded to at least the same degree as they were before being placed before these judges.

A world's court, composed of delegates chosen by each country from its own citizens, when put to a test is likely to fail in its mission. Men with the highest ideals and regard for the rights of others, with the best intentions to be impartial, will, when the fate of their own country is in the balance, sway to the side of their native land. A Frenchman will remain a Frenchman, a German will remain a German, and a citizen of the United States will always remain a true American when his own country is in danger. Men who can divest themselves of the love for their native land in order to become international citizens are yet to be found; in times of peace, possibly, but when the country which gave them birth and education and protection is endangered their instinct will paralyze their impartiality and they will cling to their mother country. Quoting Prof. Adler: "The judges you secure may be upright men, but the bias in the blood will tell. We had this exemplified amongst ourselves, in the case of the Hayes-Tilden Commission. The country was on the verge of civil war. It was finally decided to pass the matter in dispute over to 15 jurists, the best in the country. No one doubted their uprightness nor their disposition to be fair. But every time they voted on a material question the commission stood eight to seven—eight Republicans to seven Democrats. And the impartial historian says that it was the bias of party which in this crucial instance, though they were not conscious of it, gave direction to the legal mind."

Since it is the duty of every thoughtful citizen to be helpful in solving this intricate problem, I hope it will not seem presumptuous for a man of the medical profession to contribute his small part in its solution.

The plan herein submitted does not come into competition with or overthrow any of the plans proposed by others; it simply adds several new ideas. It is based upon two fundamental principles:

First. That reciprocity is a most potent factor in retaining the friendship of your neighbor.

Second. That a bond is stronger than a mere promise.

Both these principles are embodied in the plan—one in the formation of an impartial international legislative and judicial assembly, choosing its members reciprocally, and the other suggesting an international alliance treaty secured by heavy bonding.

#### INTERNATIONAL LEGISLATIVE BODY WITH JUDICIAL POWER (RECIPROCAL).

This assembly shall, as far as possible, consist of representatives from all countries. But instead of each nation electing its representatives from its country alone each should choose two from its own and five additional representatives from other nations, but no more than one from any one foreign country. Thus all nations would have an opportunity in time of peace of choosing men well known to them, in whose integrity and honesty they have the fullest confidence and to whom they would unhesitatingly submit matters of international dispute and by whose decision they would abide.

By this system of choosing representatives the danger of partiality to one's own country would materially diminish. Each representative would then consider it a point of honor to deal fairly with the country which placed implicit confidence in him. As a matter of self-interest he would act squarely and impartially, because his own country is in turn dependent upon the honesty and fairness of the foreign representatives his own country selected. Such interlocking representation would thus blend the interests of all nations, and the personal contact of the representatives would inevitably result in a very friendly relationship among nations. Reciprocity of delegates would thus create the strongest link possible between the powers, each realizing that it is to their mutual interest to treat one another with fairness and justice.

A very valuable suggestion was offered to me by one of the United States Senators to whom I submitted this problem, namely, that this assembly would necessarily have legislative power as well as judicial, since they could not decide international disputes unless they had international laws and rules as a basis for their discussions. He states:

"It is apparent, therefore, that the first step is a great international legislature rather than an international court, a legislature that shall determine and agree upon fundamental international rights which in themselves will include fundamental international duties of the countries toward each other. Having determined just what these rights are, having by the very instrument itself pledged all to protect the rights of each, then, and then only, can we provide for a great international court which must be guided by those fundamental rights and corresponding duties. Nations are free. Nations must agree together just to what extent the freedom of each may be curtailed. Having entered into that agreement there will be little difficulty in providing for an international court to decide all of the minor questions of differences under the guidance of this supreme international law."

Since the assembly would be composed of the ablest and most high-minded men in the world, the legislative duties could also be entrusted to them so that it would not only dispose of cases of international litigation but would also pass new international laws and work out other problems relating to the welfare of the whole human race.

Furthermore the nations joining this international brotherhood would no more surrender any part of their sovereignty than the original thirteen Colonies gave up their State rights when they formed the United States.

The members of this international assembly might select from their midst a smaller number, say 15, to form an international supreme court of appeals, to whose final decision any dispute might be appealed should it fail to obtain satisfactory settlement by the international court of justice.

This legislative and judicial assembly, once established, would systematize international administration similar to that of a democratic government.

#### INTERNATIONAL ALLIANCE TREATY.

When the belligerents meet to adjust their differences one question will stand out most prominently, namely, What measures shall be taken to compel all nations to live up to their treaties? New treaties will have to be entered into, and here the difficulties will arise. At present, treaties are not regarded with the same sacredness, confidence, and respect by all the powers as they were before this war. Striking examples have given us sufficient proof of this fact. Nations will now be reluctant in signing new treaties unless they receive the absolute assurance that some power even greater than the sword will compel the cosigners to live up to their agreements. They will demand a positive guarantee that the papers they sign are not mere formalities, which might again be thrown into the wastebasket when at any time the terms of the treaty do not suit one or the other party to the contract.

What satisfactory guarantee could be given to induce the powers to sign treaties and abide by them? To this question I desire to make the following suggestion:

Let the nations enter into a treaty which shall be so carefully worked out as to cover all the essential points necessary to maintain peace and secure its fulfillment by demanding the cosigning nations to put up a bond. The terms of such a treaty must necessarily cover many points embodying a code of international laws to be drafted by the international assembly.

Certain basic and essential principles must be included, some of which I mention herein:

First. All international disputes shall be submitted to the international assembly described above.

Second. In case the verdict of the international assembly be rejected by one of the contestants, it shall be submitted to the international court of appeals, whose decision shall be final.

Third. To prevent the violation of this international-alliance treaty, each country shall deposit a most substantial interest-bearing bond.

Fourth. Gradual disarmament of all nations to such a degree as to leave an army and navy for protection against internal violence and international police only.

Fifth. All countries shall be prohibited from manufacturing armament and munitions to any greater extent than agreed upon by the international assembly.

A serious violation by a nation of the international alliance treaty shall constitute sufficient cause for the forfeiture of its bond. As to what should be done with the forfeited bonds is a question which could easily be decided by those elaborating on the treaty. It could either be used for current expenses of the international assembly or in paying indemnities to any nation which has been unjustly attacked or injured, or for other purposes.

Special treaties between individual nations need not be secured by any additional bonds, because all questions of dispute would be settled by an international assembly and its decision made binding.

The bonds shall be placed in the hands of an international board of trustees, chosen by all the countries which enter into this international agreement.

The objection that a nation might repudiate its bond should a real emergency arise is met by the provision that the bonds furnished should not be paper of its own issue but securities issued and purchased from other countries, thus making their repudiation practically impossible.



To illustrate the latter proposition: Germany, for instance, would deposit securities purchased from other countries. The amounts purchased from each country to be so proportioned as to furnish a variety of securities of as many countries as possible—for instance, 10 per cent of French bonds, 10 per cent of English bonds, 10 per cent of United States bonds, 5 per cent of Swiss bonds, 5 per cent of Argentine bonds, 60 per cent of all other countries, government or industrial.

England, Russia, the United States, and all other countries entering the alliance to do likewise. The aggregate value of deposit by each nation must be so large as to make it prohibitive for that nation to forfeit it.

Judging from the opinions of statesmen and professors of international law to whom a previous copy of this paper has been submitted, I am confident that an international assembly chosen by the reciprocal method and a joint treaty of all nations diplomatically constructed (with the additional safeguard of a heavy bond against its violation) would be a sure step toward the realization of a lasting peace.

#### AN INTERNATIONAL RECIPROCAL ARMY.

We must, however, bear in mind that in the present turmoil it would be inexpedient to make a very radical reduction in the naval or military strength of the world. Radical changes must not be made suddenly; improvement must take place by a slow process. For this reason it will be necessary, for the present, for each country to maintain a certain military and naval force until there is a readjustment of present international affairs. Time will change conditions; the relations among nations will again become fraternal, but until such time we must retain a weapon aside from these agreements. A more potent restraint must be kept as a safeguard in order to check an ambitious belligerent who might suddenly break all rules and promises should he become involved in a controversy which he believes is not adjudicable.

If, then, for the present, it is absolutely necessary to retain a certain amount of force as a safeguard, could we suggest some practical and economical upkeep of an international army?

If the nations were assured that they could count upon each other for their combined but small forces against an aggressor, it would be entirely superfluous for each of them to maintain a large military organization. On the other hand, if each nation must individually protect its own rights and interests, each would be obliged to maintain an army so large that at any time it might be pitted against a combination of other powers who are equally prepared. This stupendous competition for preparedness is absorbing the greater part of the energy and the savings of the human race. They are now kept busy devising plans to kill human beings and destroy property, instead of being employed in the wholesome pursuits of life and in the development of the races. A small force allotted to each nation in its proper proportion would be just as effective in deciding the so-called "nonadjudicable" questions as a large force on each side, and it would be vastly more economical. I would, therefore, suggest a plan which would be most economical and at the same time sufficiently effective to check any attempt on the part of any nation to create war.

A. Each nation to have a standing army of well-trained, well-paid soldiers, not larger than is actually necessary to protect itself against internal disturbances.

B. The size of this army should be in proportion to the population.

C. The armies of all countries should have a combined general staff, so that the armies may be trained on the same principles of warfare and should be so organized that on the shortest notice a call would bring together a force large enough to check an unjust aggression.

D. Finally, a number of regiments of the army of one country should be stationed in different sections of foreign countries for a stated period. For illustration, an American soldier would serve one year at home, six months in France, and six months in Germany, and the French or German soldier would have a like experience. This would give all armies an equal chance to perfect themselves in military training and become acquainted with the military tactics of allied countries. At the same time, the military force of all countries would become familiar with the terrain of the various countries, which, in case of a sudden outbreak of war, would be of great advantage to the combined powers in checking the aggressor.

Such military education might create a friendly spirit among the different armies. It would work out in a manner similar to that of the reciprocal representation of jurists of all countries. Aside from policing the country in peace times, the armies could be of service in many ways as teaching citizenship to immigrants and maintaining a merchant marine.

I realize that this plan is not worked out in detail, and there are, no doubt, many points not covered. But if I have succeeded in convincing those who are now studying this question, that reciprocity is fundamental for international harmony, and that bonds will be an added safeguard against the recurrence of war, I will be satisfied that I have helped in bringing this problem nearer its solution.

EMIL G. BECK, M. D., F. A. C. S.,  
3632 Lake View Avenue.

#### LIGNITE COAL.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3220) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to make investigations, through the Bureau of Mines, of lignite coals and peat to determine the practicability of their utilization as a fuel and in producing commercial products.

Mr. HENDERSON. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House and request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. HENDERSON, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. POINDEXTER conferees on the part of the Senate.

#### HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Public Lands:

H. R. 5989. An act to grant certain lands to the town of Olathe, Colo., for the protection of its water supply;

H. R. 8625. An act to accept from the Southern Oregon Co., a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Oregon, a reconveyance of the lands granted to the State of

Oregon by the act approved March 3, 1869, entitled "An act granting lands to the State of Oregon to aid in the construction of a military wagon road from the navigable waters of Coos Bay to Roseburg, in said State," commonly known as the Coos Bay Wagon Road grant, to provide for the disposition of said lands, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12210. An act to amend the act of May 14, 1898, as amended by the act of March 3, 1903, entitled "An act to extend the homestead laws and to regulate the sale and entry of public lands along the shore of navigable waters in Alaska";

H. R. 12579. An act to grant to citizens of Malheur County, Oreg., the right to cut timber in the State of Idaho for agricultural, mining, or other domestic purposes, and to remove such timber to Malheur County, Oreg.; and

H. R. 13042. An act providing for the extension of time for the reclamation of certain lands in the State of Oregon under the Carey Act.

H. R. 4246. An act to increase the salary of the United States district attorney for the district of Connecticut was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 12881. An act to increase the cost of the public building at Eldorado, Kans., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. R. 13306. An act to authorize the payment of allotments out of the pay of enlisted men in certain cases in which these payments have been discontinued was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### LEAGUE OF NATIONS FOR PEACE.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, day before yesterday I gave notice that it was my intention to submit some remarks to-day on the proposition of a world league of nations and on the coming peace conference and connected subjects. However, I forgot and left at home this morning a book from which I want to read some extracts when I submit my remarks, and I will not be able to make to-day the remarks that I intended to make. I hope to-morrow at the close of the morning business, if I may be permitted to do so, to submit the remarks that I had intended to make to-day on a league of nations, the coming peace conference, and some incidents connected therewith.

Mr. STERLING. Mr. President, I desire to give notice that on Saturday, at the close of the morning business, I shall ask permission to address the Senate on the subject of a league of nations.

#### AFFAIRS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I ask the consent of the Senate to make a short statement in reply to a number of addresses that have been made here upon the subject of affairs in Russia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there further morning business? There is none. Is there any objection to the Senator from Nebraska proceeding? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, recently the administration has been criticized from two standpoints on the Russian situation. First, it has been criticized to some extent because it did not yield to the urgent desire of Great Britain and France and enter Russia with a large force for the purpose of establishing or reestablishing an eastern front against Germany. More recently it has been criticized on the floor of the Senate by a number of Senators because it has sent soldiers into Russia. On these two criticisms it seems to me proper to make a short statement, which can not in the nature of the case be authoritative, because I only speak from what knowledge I have been able to gain, which is, perhaps, not much better than that any other Senator has secured. These two attacks, however, come from directly opposite directions, and they indicate the embarrassment that confronted President Wilson in deciding what policy to adopt.

Geographically, of course, there is a Russia. Politically there has not been a Russia for probably a year. When we entered the war we entered it side by side with Russia, as well as with the other nations that were allied with Russia to fight Germany. When the Russian revolution first developed and Kerensky came to the head of the Russian Government, it still retained a semblance at least of a national shape and form. We recognized that Government of Russia. We sent a commission over there, as will be remembered, headed by ex-Senator Root. That Russian Government along about the month of October or November, 1917, was overthrown, and since that time it is not too much to say that there has been no government, as civilization understands government, in Russia, except a series of local governments throughout the vast expanse of that Empire.

The Lenin-Trotsky government has been far more prominent than any other in Russia, because it held Petrograd, the capital, and Moscow, the ancient city of Russia, and some of



the other industrial centers. It was prominent because it was recognized by Germany. Germany had been the only nation which recognized it as a national government.

The statement has been made that the Lenin-Trotsky government was not pro-German. I am unable to see how that statement can be believed by anyone who has read the history of the last year. In the first place, Lenin and Trotsky got into Russia by the grace of Germany. There is very substantial reason for believing and considerable evidence to prove that Lenin and Trotsky operated with German credit. Certainly in everything that they have done they have carried out the will of Germany. They signed with Germany a treaty which practically gave Germany everything she asked for, including a large sum of money, which they had already begun to send to Germany when the belligerent nations fighting Germany put a stop to it. They established in Petrograd, near by, a German ambassador, and Russian and other travelers who have come to this country from Russia have told me that he rules virtually as a king in Petrograd.

Not only that, but the Lenin-Trotsky government has driven out of Russia every representative of every civilized country on the face of the earth, including our own, and to-day, except for the German representative in Petrograd, there is not a single representative of any nation in the world except, perhaps, of Switzerland, and he is in jail.

To say under those circumstances that there is either a national government in Russia or that it is not pro-German seems to me to be going entirely too far. Whatever Germany asked for she got from Russia. German officers and German soldiers who were captured and prisoners held in camp have been released and permitted to organize forces which undertook, in connection with the Bolsheviks, to crush the little Czecho-Slovak Army in Russia.

I have in my hand a photograph, which I procured from the State Department, showing Russian soldiers gathered in a large group and among them German officers in uniform. The statement attached to this photograph reads as follows:

The attached photograph was obtained from an official Bolshevik photographer through a dependable intermediary; it was taken shortly after the capture of Yaroslavl northeast of Moscow by the Bolshevik forces in the latter part of July, 1918. The photograph was sent to the department as confirming information previously obtained from independent sources that the Bolshevik forces were enabled to drive their opponents from Yaroslavl by reason of direct German military aid, reference apparently being had to the German uniforms to be noted.

Mr. President, I have in my hand here among other things a statement made by Capt. Vladimir S. Hurban, of the Czecho-Slovak army in Russia, when he came to the United States to visit Prof. T. G. Masaryk, then in this country and now the duly elected President of the new Czecho-Slovak Government. He described in this statement how the Czecho-Slovak Army, 50,000 or 60,000 strong, as I recall it, was formed in Russia at the time Russia was fighting Germany. Those Czecho-Slovaks had been originally in the Austrian Army and refused to fight their Russian brothers, and had gone over and surrendered in a great body to the Russians, and by the Russians at the time Russia was fighting Germany, before the days of the Lenin-Trotsky revolution, the Czecho-Slovaks were organized into a force fighting Germany among the Russians.

After Trotsky-Lenin surrendered to the Germans this sturdy band of Czecho-Slovaks resolved neither to surrender to the Germans nor to accept the clemency offered by the Emperor of Austria. They could not fight all Germany alone. They resolved, if possible, to go through Russia and reach Vladivostok, to cross the Pacific, to cross North America, and then to go to the western front in France in order to continue the war for liberty upon which they had entered. Capt. Hurban says:

Our army in Russia was organized from Czech and Slovak prisoners of war under almost insurmountable difficulties. We were cooperating with the Russian Army, and since 1917 we were practically the only army on the Russian front capable of any military action in the proper sense of the word. In July, 1917, during the first revolutionary offensive under Kerensky, it was only our army that really attacked and advanced.

When the Bolshevik-Soviet government signed the peace treaty at the beginning of March, our army of about 50,000 men was in Ukraine, near Kiev.

Then he goes on to describe what they did, and says:

The Germans advanced against us in overwhelming numbers, and there was danger that we would be surrounded on all sides, on the right and left flank; our rear was not covered, and the Germans were liable to attack us from the rear. We had no lines of communication behind us, no stores of materials, and no reserves; everywhere there was disorganization and anarchy, and the Bolshevik red guards seized the locomotives and were fleeing east in panic.

Under these circumstances Emperor Charles sent us a special envoy with the promise that if we disarm we will be "amnestied" and our lands will receive "autonomy." We answered that we will not negotiate with the Austrian Emperor.

As we could not hold a front, we began a retreat to the east. Already then in agreement with the allies (our army had been proclaimed a part of the Czecho-Slovak Army on the western front, and thus allied

with the French Army), it was decided to transport our army over Siberia and America to France. We began the difficult retreat from Kiev. The Germans in an overwhelming force were trying to prevent our escape. About a hundred miles behind us they seized the important railroad junction at Bachmac, which we were obliged to pass in our trains on our retreat to the east.

Then he goes on to describe the contests not only with the German Army but with released German prisoners in Russia, released on orders of the Bolsheviks for the purpose of attacking and annihilating this Czecho-Slovak Army.

The story is too long for me to read, and I shall not encumber the Record with it, but I only cite it to show that we have an authoritative statement here to the effect that these Czecho-Slovak armies stood at that time in Russia as the one organized body to fight Germany as we were fighting Germany. This not only shows the pro-German character of the Trotsky-Lenin government, but it shows that Russia, which had ceased to be a nation, and over which anarchy and civil war were spreading, was the battle ground upon which Germany must be fought, and here were fifty or sixty thousand men trying to wage that war.

Under those circumstances Great Britain and France were very urgent that America should do her part in entering by way of Vladivostok on the Pacific Ocean and making safe this long line of communication, 5,000 miles, to the Ural Mountains in Russia. What was to be done? Was the President to ignore that body of Czecho-Slovaks? Was he to refuse entirely the request of the nations that we were cooperating with? Was he to permit the Germans absolutely to get control of Russia and use it as an instrument in the war? It seems to me he could do nothing less than he did. He finally consented that a small force of Americans, 10,200, should be landed at Vladivostok in connection with the Japanese, British, and French forces there, and not only take possession of the great stores of munitions, which had come from America, but also to undertake to perfect in connection with the other forces this long line of communication so that the Czecho-Slovaks could either get out and get to France, or if they remained there to fight to have supplies brought to them.

We landed 10,000 men. The Japanese landed a much larger force, which they have since been reducing. The effect of that landing was to put a stop to the organization of German prisoners, of whom there were 58,000 in that part of Siberia. It made it impossible for them to capture Vladivostok, as was intended. The effect of that landing was to restore to a more or less perfect extent that long line of communication, and to-day for over 5,000 miles from Vladivostok to the neighborhood of the Ural Mountains that line of communication is in more or less constant operation.

It is idle to say under those circumstances that the 2,000 men we sent in and the small body of Japanese and British sent in could have subjugated that whole country. The fact is that they were received with open arms. They went in as allies and friends of all that part of Russia. They did not go in as conquerors, and they do not leave there as conquerors to-day. There is a local government functioning at Vladivostok in entire harmony with the allied troops that are there. There is local government at Omsk functioning in entire harmony. Of course, it is a dictatorship at the present time, under Kolchak. For a while it was five men, and now it is practically one man, who has perhaps 200,000 under his control. He is maintaining a front there against the Soviet powers, supported by German officers and German men. There is a government at Vladivostok; there is a large force operating down in south Russia near the line of the Caucasus; and there is the government which has been organized at Archangel and down the Murman coast, also recognizing the Kolchak government and a Russian Army outside of the Lenin-Trotsky government.

Now, can it be said that we have gone in to fight the Government of Russia when over this whole region of 5,000 miles we are received with satisfaction and applause and cooperation? Can it be said that when we went in to fight Germany on ground chosen by Germany against agents chosen by Germany we went in illegally to fight the Russian Government and the Russian people? No, Mr. President; I think there was every justification for going in.

I have spoken of landing at Vladivostok with 10,200 men. We also made a landing at Archangel. Archangel has been the port at which vast supplies of war munitions and coal have been landed from Great Britain. Our army of occupation went in there to save those supplies, for one thing. It went in there also on the Murman coast, just across the White Sea, for the purpose of preventing Germany from carrying out the purpose which she evidently had at that time to secure a port and a base for her submarine vessels.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—



The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENDERSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Assuming that there was sufficient justification for sending an armed force into Russia at the time it was sent, when we were fighting Germany before the armistice was signed, and that there was a German force there, do I understand from the Senator that we are still contending against the same enemy with whom we were contending prior to the signing of the armistice?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I shall come to that a little later. I am trying to develop this in some order.

Mr. TOWNSEND. May I interrupt the Senator for a moment?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I understood the Senator to state that our troops at Archangel and Vladivostok were there in harmony with the people of those communities. The information comes to me directly that we are fighting there.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will take that up. At Vladivostok there has been no fighting. It is entirely peaceable, and the normal course of business has been resumed. It is one of the most orderly places in all Russia at the present time. There has been some fighting at Archangel and some fighting on the Murman coast, very close to that. We have, as a matter of fact, only 5,000 men between Archangel and the Murman coast combined. France and Great Britain have larger bodies of troops; I do not know exactly how many; perhaps 15,000. We seized those ports because they had great supplies there which had to be protected, which had been made with American and British and French labor and paid for by American, British, and French money when we thought we were sending them to a nation allied with us. We not only took those ports because we had a right to protect those supplies, but because we wanted to head off Germany, that then had 30,000 men crossing Finland for the purpose of seizing the Murman coast and establishing there a port for her submarines.

There is another reason. We know how anxious we were in this country concerning our diplomatic representatives in Petrograd, who finally were compelled to move to Vologda, which is in the direction of Archangel. By seizing Archangel we made means by which they could get out of Russia, and they might have had none other. We know that several murders and assassinations had occurred there; that there were most disgraceful, barbaric assaults upon the British Embassy there in which a fine British officer—I think a naval attaché—was shot down in cold blood. Before our ambassador left a sentry had been placed in front of his door and he had been practically notified that he would be under military surveillance and control unless he came back to Petrograd.

With such barbaric treatment of diplomatic representatives, it was a very wise thing to have possession of some ports, in order that there might be, if necessary, a means of getting out. The idea that a government exists under the administration of Lenin and Trotzky to-day in the sense that civilized people could call it a government is absolutely preposterous. There is not any government there; it is the most absolute tyranny; and if we were against the idea of the old autocratic form of government, we certainly must condemn, as we have refused to recognize, the form of an absolute tyranny of the most brutal character, which recognizes no law whatever.

I was talking the other day to one of the secretaries of our embassy, who has recently returned from Russia, and who has now already left this country for another post. He told me of sitting in the office of a commissaire, I think, and it was in Vologda, and talking to him and endeavoring to get a permit or some better treatment for the embassy, when a clerk brought in a number of documents and placed them on his desk, and he took up his pen and signed them, one after another, without even reading them. They were so near to him that this gentleman was able to see what they were, and each one of them was a sentence of death, which that man signed just as though it had been a formal letter.

That is what is going on in Russia, and when this man undertook to leave Vologda, practically under compulsion, as it was unsafe longer to stay there, he went to the railroad station to buy his ticket an hour before leaving. He was told that there was no place on the train. He protested that that could not be so; that he must be able to buy a ticket. A commissaire was standing near, and he stepped up to him and said, "I have a friend who has a ticket which I can get for you." "What will he charge extra—anything?" "Yes; he wants"—I think he said—"50 rubles." The ticket only cost 50 rubles; but he said, "He wants to get 50 rubles extra for it if he sells it to you."

So this American representative agreed that he would pay 50 rubles extra in order to get this ticket. The commissaire said, "You have got to pay me something for finding him for you"; and finally the official was compelled to pay this man 25 rubles for the privilege of paying 50 rubles extra for the ticket! Then the commissaire went around in the room and got the ticket from the man who had just refused to sell it to the American.

This American got aboard the train, which started. After the train had passed over the first division and into the second division it came to a stop. The passengers waited half an hour, then an hour, and finally they had a committee go to inquire what was the trouble, why the train did not go on. The reply was that the train crew was striking, and that they were not going on until the passengers raised a hundred rubles per car. The passengers went to work and they raised a hundred rubles per car. The train then proceeded. When it got to the next division of the road it stopped again, and they made more prompt inquiry this time to find out what the trouble was. They were told that the men in the roundhouse would not let the engine out to draw the train unless they raised a hundred rubles per car. They had to raise another hundred rubles per car. So it took them 40 hours to make a 10-hour trip. I merely cite that to show the absolute economic and industrial demoralization there. To say that that is a country with a government is absolutely absurd. There is no government in Russia.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not want to interrupt the Senator from Nebraska in the logical presentation of his view, but I hope before he closes that he will make it plain whether, all this being true, it is any justification for our being in Russia.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I will take that up immediately. We went in there, I say, as a war measure; we went in there last June, when the war was at its height. So far as Vladivostok was concerned we saved those supplies; we saved a long line of communications; we saved the Czecho-Slovak Army; we defeated the purpose of the Germans to destroy that army and to get possession of the country. We went into the Murman coast and prevented the Germans from getting a warm-water harbor there for their submarines as a base. We got Archangel, and kept that port with its supplies and the means of escape of our ambassador, who was still at that time in Russia. We accomplished what we went there for, but we went in by an agreement with Great Britain and Japan. We went in with them, and, as I have said, at the height of the war. We have not yet come to the end of the war, although we have an armistice. We could not instantly leave the minute the signing of the armistice had come. We could not abandon the stores there; we could not open the door and invite Germany now to make an offensive in that direction. We could not violate the agreement we have with those with whom we went in. We are under some obligations to them.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Will the Senator from Nebraska state the agreement which we have?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not know it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That is what we seek to know. That is why I have been listening so intently to the Senator as the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, in the hope that we might learn some of the details. I take it that his speech is wholly authoritative, or the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee would not make it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I hope the Senator from California will not assume that there was a written agreement that we would do certain things. The entrance into those ports was undertaken on the recommendation, if not by the demand, of the supreme war council in Paris as a war measure and when the war was at its height. I suppose that we have no more an agreement in writing to do that than we had with France and Great Britain when we joined the French and British in France. We went there, though, for the purpose of cooperating with them, and we are remaining to cooperate with them. We are on the Murman coast to cooperate with them, we are in Archangel to cooperate with them, and we are in Vladivostok to cooperate with them. We can not throw them down and abandon them in the twinkling of an eye while Germany is still threatening possibly to undertake war measures.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If the Senator will yield, I simply repeated the very language that he used in respect to an "agreement" that we have with these various powers, and, repeating that language, I ask him what the agreement was? I do not mean that it was a written agreement. I do not know but it is a secret treaty. I do not know what it is.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think I should withdraw the word "agreement." I think I should say in cooperation with those powers we were there.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. While I am on my feet, so that I may not again interrupt the Senator—and I shall not do so, because I shall take the opportunity, with the permission of the Senate, at some time in the future to respond—but if the Senator will permit me one further question, how far inland are American troops now? Can the Senator tell me?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The American troops are at Vladivostok, on the Pacific coast.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not mean there; I mean on the Murmansk coast—from Archangel?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will make this statement complete. The American troops are at Vladivostok and in the immediate neighborhood, as I understand, on the Pacific coast. The Japanese troops are largely at Lake Baikal, which is perhaps a couple of thousand miles inland. Another body of French and British are cooperating with the Czecho-Slovaks perhaps 4,500 miles inland. The American troops are at Archangel and at Murmansk with the French and British. Their outposts have proceeded as far inland, possibly, as 80 or 100 miles in some cases, merely for the purpose of protecting those bases. We did not want to let the opposing forces under German leadership come right up to the ports. They have thrown these outposts out and they are merely holding them against attack.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Can the Senator from Nebraska tell how far Kadish is from Archangel?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I can not. I only have general information. It is somewhere in the neighborhood.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is the Senator able to say how many towns and cities and villages the American troops have taken?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Does the Senator say that he does not know?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I do not know.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is the Senator able to say how great an area of square miles the American troops are operating in?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; I have not any knowledge of that sort; that is military knowledge which I have not.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Is the Senator aware that there are various towns that have been taken by American troops advancing into Russia and that they have been taken in each instance against troops stationed in those various towns?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have not any doubt that not only the American troops, but that the British and the French troops, have advanced far enough inland to protect those bases, and that they are now acting on the defensive. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] stated yesterday they are making no further advance, and that they only went far enough to protect their bases and to carry out the purposes for which they went there.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, will the Senator say when the advance was discontinued?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No; I have not that date, and I do not consider it of any importance.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. They have, I believe, taken town after town as they have gone forward, have they not, and only ceased to advance because winter has made it essential that they cease?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the Senator is entirely mistaken. My information is that they merely advanced far enough to set up the usual posts that are required to protect their bases, the base being in one case Archangel and in the other Murmansk; that the fighting that has occurred since then has been defensive; and that the Americans were expelled from one town by the Russian Bolsheviks, with their German assistants, but have recovered it. That is the only advance that I have heard of in recent months.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. May we take it, then, as authoritatively announced by the State Department that no other advance is to be made?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should not like to speak for what may happen in the future.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. May we assume, from the Senator's argument, that if it were not for the presence of the German influence in that country there would be no occasion for our remaining in Russia?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is my judgment. The German danger is the real cause of our presence there.

Mr. BORAH. Then I assume we are there under and by authority of Gen. Foch.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Undoubtedly. He insists, I understand, on maintaining the status there; in fact, he is anxious to have more done.

Mr. BORAH. Now, Mr. President, we are arriving at a point from which we may reason as to our duty. The complaint which may be justly lodged against the situation, it seems to me, is that we have been in utter darkness as to why we are there, what the object to be attained is, or under whose authority we were there. Now, does the Senator say that we are there under the authority of Gen. Foch?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We are there under the authority of the United States in cooperation with the other forces of which Foch is the generalissimo. We went in there to fight the Germans, as I have stated, at the time when the war was at its height and bid fair to continue for years, and at a time when Russia had been largely brought under German control, not only military control, but commercial and banking control, to the extent that the national bank notes of Russia were being printed in Germany.

Mr. BORAH. To my mind there can be only one justification for our being in Russia, and that is because of the situation superinduced by German activities. If I may be permitted to express my view, it is none of our business so far as military intervention is concerned as to what is going on in Russia. Unless it is part and parcel of the conflict in which we have been engaged, which is the defeat of Germany, we can not justify remaining there any longer than it will take to get out.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. It ought to be made so plain that there could be no possible mistake about it that we are there by reason of that fact; that we have remained there by reason of that fact; and what it is that we are to accomplish before we leave there.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield further to the Senator from California?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If the facts are as just stated, to which a ready acquiescence is yielded by the Senator from Nebraska, I ask what possible objection can there be to the Government of the United States saying why it is over there, what it intends to do, and what it expects to accomplish? The Senator rises as the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and says he does not speak authoritatively or for the Government. I observe by the Record that when I was absent day before yesterday the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee [Mr. SWANSON] expressly disclaimed that he spoke authoritatively or for the Government. Why is it that our Government can not tell us why we are there, what we intend to do, and what our ultimate purposes are? If that were done, then, with some degree of intelligence, we might debate at least what the Government says to us.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, of course I realize that our form of government is not like the form of government they have in Great Britain, where the representative of the administration sitting in the legislative hall answers questions and makes authoritative statements, but I have endeavored to meet the Senator's request for information, and I think I have gone to a legitimate extent concerning the facts as they actually exist. I do not see how anyone can have any doubt in reviewing those facts that we went in there to fight Germany when the war was at its height; that the Germans were there ahead of us; that the Bolsheviks had thousands and perhaps hundreds of thousands of men on the ground who were being released from prison under German influence; that those men were getting arms; that they were going to seize Vladivostok; that they were going to seize other harbors in Russia; and that they were going to use Russia as a military base. We were justified in connection with the other countries with which we are cooperating in going in there.

There will be a time when we will have to come out. We evidently did not go in there as conquerors of Russia. I have endeavored to set forth that the result of our presence there has been that over a distance of 5,000 miles, a whole empire, our people have been received in a friendly manner and are acting in cooperation with the Russian local government.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.



Mr. CALDER. I listened to the Senator's statement a moment ago relative to the number of British and French troops operating in the neighborhood of Archangel. My information is—and this information was as of November 10, given to me by a naval officer who had returned from Archangel—that on that date we had something in the neighborhood of 2,000 troops there, and that France and England each had less troops than we had in that country.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have no warrant for speaking as to the French and the British, but I have warrant for saying that we have 10,200 troops at Vladivostok, and that we landed about 5,000 troops at Archangel for use there and on the Murman coast.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. I do not know whether the Senator has the information or not, and I do not know whether he would feel authorized to give it if he had it, but an interesting situation is presented by reason of the fact that Japan is withdrawing her troops. Can the Senator tell why it is that Japan, with whom we entered Russia, feels that the situation is such that she may properly withdraw her troops?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have some knowledge that I do not know that I am justified in giving. Japan landed a much larger body of troops than we had expected would be landed, a body of troops larger than we thought was necessary to be landed. I say "we," I mean the administration. I do not know what influences are now inducing Japan to reduce those numbers so that they will conform more nearly with the number of men that we landed; but that is the fact the number is being reduced; and the very fact that it is being reduced shows that there is no great danger there from the Russian people; that they are in a friendly country, and feel safe with a much smaller body of troops than they went in with.

Mr. BORAH. In view of the fact, Mr. President, that it is pretty generally understood, as nearly as we can understand anything in regard to the situation, that the small number of American troops in Russia are pretty hard pressed and are in great danger not only from weather and disease, but from being so surrounded as that they may never get out at all, I hardly suppose that our Government requested that the forces there, from whatever source they were supplied, should be reduced.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The men at Archangel are not hard pressed. The fighting has ceased there, and has ceased for months. There is order there. There is merely an army of occupation. The only fighting that is going on now is along the Murman coast and above Archangel, on the river; and the fighting there has evidently been grossly exaggerated in the newspaper reports, because we have, under date of January 4, a report by cable from that point that the total number of men killed in battle since we landed there is only 126; so the mortality indicates that the fighting is not of a very desperate character.

Mr. BORAH. Are there no Japanese troops in the near vicinity of the place where the fighting has been going on?

Mr. NELSON. No; there are none there. They are all on the Siberian Railroad.

Mr. BORAH. How long would it take them to get from the point where the fighting has not been to the point where the fighting is going on?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Japanese are not near the scene of the fighting. They are only an army of occupation and support. They are keeping open the trans-Siberian line. They entered by way of Vladivostok, and, of course, they are not on the Murman coast, nor near Archangel. They are 800 miles from that point.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NELSON. The farthest west that the Japanese have gotten is a point near Irkutsk, and from there over to where our troops are, south of Archangel, is probably from 500 to 700 miles. You have to go west on the Siberian Railroad, beyond Perm, in the Ural Mountains, and then west of that—I do not remember the name of the station—is a station where the railroad runs up to Archangel. The Japanese have not been within, I think it can safely be said, five or six thousand miles of our forces in Archangel.

Mr. BORAH. I understand there are no Japanese, then, at points where the fighting has been going on?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That is my impression. That is, there was some fighting immediately upon their landing at Vladivostok. That fighting was largely with German-officered Bol-

sheviki—Germans who had been released from camps in Siberia near Vladivostok, some 50,000 in number—and the fighting occurred there months ago and has not been repeated for months.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me a minute there?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. The situation is this: Our troops are in and about Vladivostok on the east. The Japanese have gotten as far west as Irkutsk, the capital of trans-Baikalia, near Lake Baikal. The Czecho-Slovaks, with the aid of Russians and a naval officer whose name I can not pronounce, have advanced along the Siberian Railroad as far as Omsk, the capital of western Siberia; and their latest report is that they have advanced as far as Perm, the principal point in eastern European Russia west of the Ural Mountains. They are advancing in that direction, and there has been no particular fighting. The only fighting that the American troops have had anything to do with is in the country south of Archangel; and if Senators will study the geography of the country they will find that that country to the south from the Murman coast and the Kola Peninsula and from Archangel, at the south of the White Sea, is a swampy, timbered country, thinly and sparsely settled, and there are no great towns and no great villages in that country. As the Senator from Nebraska has well said, the troops have just advanced along that line, which runs at right angles to the Siberian line, far enough south to protect their base and the country they have gone into. There may be a few scattered villages; but close to that country in northern Russia, south of the Kola Peninsula and south of the White Sea, is a wilderness of swamps and timber and all kinds of country, very sparsely settled. It does not include what may be called the agricultural or civilized, developed portions of Russia.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President—

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a suggestion there? My information is that during the summer of 1917 allied troops, including American troops and some Russians, anti-Bolsheviks, advanced a short distance south of Archangel for the purpose of establishing, if it became necessary, winter quarters, and they erected some structures. The Bolsheviks later on made an advance and captured some of the buildings which had been erected. As I understand, there has been some fighting between the allies and American forces in their efforts to regain and hold against the Bolsheviks these buildings and outposts, constituting in part their winter quarters.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that I am taking the time of the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I want to propound one more interrogatory to the Senator from Nebraska, if I may, and then I will cease.

Day before yesterday, or day before that, I observed a press dispatch—I am entirely skeptical of press dispatches about Russia—but, nevertheless, this one said that England had determined to withdraw her troops from Russia. The Senator may have observed it as well. I ask whether or not he can enlighten us on that subject, whether it is a fact or whether it is not a fact?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have no knowledge as to what the intentions of the British Government are in this respect.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. The Senator probably observed the press dispatch.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I noticed something to that effect. I presume that all the troops are coming out of Russia. It is merely a matter of time when that will be done.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me just one minute—

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. In reply to the Senator from California, I should like to state that Lord Milner, who has been looking after the Russian military situation for Great Britain, gave out a statement in which quite the contrary appears, although he states in conclusion—

Mr. JOHNSON of California. That was some weeks ago, though, if the Senator will observe.

Mr. KING. No; December 18.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes; but this dispatch was within the last three days, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I saw that dispatch, but I have also seen it contradicted.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. SWANSON. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Nebraska, since inquiries have been made regarding the purpose of the President in Russia, that the President, in the sixth of his 14 points which have been agreed to for the making of peace, has a specific declaration in reference to Russia, which I should like at this time to read. First:

The evacuation of all Russian territory.

That has been agreed to, and that is one of the conditions of peace.

Mr. KING. It has been agreed to by Germany.

Mr. SWANSON. The evacuation of all Russian territory by the peoples who have agreed to it; I mean, ultimately, when the time comes for peace, when peace is made.

Second—

Such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest cooperation of the nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, may I call to the Senator's attention the fact that the sixth term of peace that he reads is the sixth term of peace with Germany, not with Russia?

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator will remember, this is a condition upon which the allies, including France and England, agreed to make peace with Germany and Austria and among themselves; and, as I understand, this is intended as a settlement of this great world war.

Further permit me to say the sixth of the 14 items continues:

And, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire.

But it goes farther than that to warn other nations that they have no right to despoil Russia, and that the test of their fairness will be their treatment of Russia. On that point the President says:

The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

It seems to me that the sixth of the conditions upon which peace will be made with Germany assures to Russia no spoliation of her territory.

Mr. BORAH. That does not throw any light at all upon what our troops are at the present time doing in Russia. Do we understand that they are to remain until the 14 points are established?

Mr. SWANSON. It throws this light on it absolutely: That they went there for correct purposes; that they are not there for any improper purpose, as has been intimated. It shows clearly that the President, when these troops were sent there, sent them there under that condition, as far as he had power to pledge this country.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, at the time the President delivered that address covering the 14 points the President had a policy with reference to Russia which, in my humble judgment, was a very correct policy. The President, however, through the persuasions of others, modified that policy afterwards. I have reason to believe that he modified it with a great deal of reluctance, and it is with the modification now that we are dealing and not with the policy which the President originally outlined and which, in my judgment, had he been permitted to do so, he would have followed.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, if I may be permitted to reply to the Senator, I will say that I understand that there has been no modification of the ultimate policy with reference to Russia. Conditions arose, after the collapse of Russia, in which it was necessary to hold these two places for warlike purposes.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, at the time the President made that address he had nothing in view in the way of sending troops into Russia, and it was some time before he consented to it.

Mr. SWANSON. But—if the Senator will permit me, and then I will not interrupt further—in his address to Germany and to the allies transmitting the communications of Germany, this treatment of Russia is reiterated as one of the 14 articles of the basis upon which peace is to be made. This is what he has pledged as a basis of peace, as one of the 14 points upon which the world shall make peace.

Mr. BORAH. And with which I thoroughly agree so far as Russia is concerned. But we are not in Russia to establish the 14 points, I suspect.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I think there is another answer to the point made by the Senator from Idaho, and that is that an authoritative statement was given out by the State Department at the time our troops were sent to Russia, and that

statement was given wide publicity at the time, and with the consent of the Senator I will read a paragraph of it:

As the Government of the United States sees the present circumstances, therefore, military action is admissible in Russia now only to render such protection and help as is possible to the Czecho-Slovaks against the armed Austrian and German prisoners who are attacking them and to steady any efforts at self-government or self-defense in which the Russians themselves may be willing to accept assistance. Whether from Vladivostok or from Murmansk and Archangel, the only present object for which American troops will be employed will be to guard military stores which may subsequently be needed by Russian forces and to render such aid as may be acceptable to the Russians in the organization of their own self-defense.

I have already recited how eminently welcome these American troops have been. They are cooperating with the local governments of the people, the Soviets, not only in Vladivostok but from Vladivostok to the Ural Mountains—5,000 miles. It can not be said under those circumstances that we have sent in those troops to fight Russia, when they are welcomed by these Soviets and are cooperating with the forces that up to very recently were fighting Germany.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Idaho permit a question?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that when the Government of the United States and the allies learned that there were 300,000 or more German and Austrian prisoners between a point perhaps four hundred or a thousand miles west of Lake Baikal and Vladivostok, many of whom were in the vicinity of Vladivostok, that they were being released and armed by the Bolsheviks, so far as the Bolsheviks could arm them, for the purpose of utilizing them to fight not only Japan but the United States and the allied Governments, and keeping in mind the further fact that there were 50,000 Czecho-Slovaks fighting battles for the same cause that the allies were fighting for, there was no obligation resting upon the allied Governments and the United States to try to protect the Czecho-Slovaks and at the same time to prevent the 300,000 liberated prisoners being molded into an instrumentality for use against the allied forces?

Mr. BORAH. I take it that the Senator from Utah is stating his own view, because the Senator from Idaho has made no suggestion from which such a suggestion could be drawn. I have not criticized the sending of troops into Russia in the first instance. I assumed that when it was done it was done in order to carry out the view of Gen. Foch with reference to taking care of the military situation, and I, therefore, was naturally not disposed to question it; and I do not now question the wisdom of having them sent there at that time. I simply say that at the present time I am unable to understand why the fighting should be continued under present conditions. That has nothing to do with the original sending of the men over there. That was, we will assume, the proper thing to do; but they are there now, and they have apparently engaged in conflict and are marching to some destination—the particular destination is unknown—having in view some object or purpose, which object or purpose we do not know.

Now, if it is distinctly understood here to-day that the American troops are in Russia at the present time performing no duties other than those of protecting those stores and those provisions which they went there to protect, so far as I am concerned I have no criticism to offer; but if the facts which are published coming from Russia be true, it is a most peculiar and extraordinary way which they have of protecting those stores. They are apparently marching inland, or fighting their way inland, for a reason which is not made plain even by the very able statement of the Senator from Nebraska.

If, however, the Senator from Nebraska states and the Senator from Utah states that the sole and only purpose or object which those troops have there at the present time is to protect those stores in an intelligent way, then, so far as I am concerned, I have no criticism to offer.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. KING. I can assure the Senator, so far as I have obtained information—and I have inquired of the State Department and various sources where information can be obtained—that there is no present purpose upon the part of the allied governments to make any further advancement southerly from the Murman coast or from Archangel than was made for the protection of the supplies and their base of operations. There were, as I suggested to the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] a few moments ago, some outposts or winter quarters provided in anticipation that the troops might have to remain in northern Russia during the winter months and at some distance south of Archangel, but only at such points as were necessary for the protection of their base of operations. Some of the Bolsheviks invaded the winter quarters some time ago;



and it is merely for the purpose, as I am advised, of maintaining their position and rendering their base of operations secure that a slight advance was made, with a view to recapturing the outposts taken by the Bolsheviks. This constitutes the attacks, as they are called, to which the press refers. The American troops, as well as the allied forces, are acting merely defensively and not offensively.

But, speaking for myself, I regret that the allied Governments—and I include the United States in the words "allied Governments"—have not taken in the past stronger measures for the purpose of protecting Russia as well as themselves, and in order that they might wall in the Bolshevik murderers and madmen, so that the fires which they are lighting in Europe might not spread into Germany and other European lands and undo much that has been accomplished by the allied Governments. I believe that if the allied Governments had sent into Russia in June and July of last year fifty or one hundred thousand troops and given heart to the Russians and to the Czechoslovaks the Bolsheviks would have been overcome before this time, and the Russian people would have had an opportunity to organize a government that would have afforded them protection and been an agency under which they could have worked out their destiny and salvation.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses.

Mr. THOMAS. The Senator from Idaho has the floor.

Mr. BORAH. I have not yielded the floor. Does the Senator desire to ask me a question?

Mr. THOMAS. I wish to ask the Senator from Utah a question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield for that purpose?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS. From what the Senator from Utah stated just before taking his seat, I am led to the conclusion—I hope he will correct me if I am wrong—that the policy to be pursued in Russia from now on is so purely defensive that the Czechoslovaks will be abandoned to their fate. Is that the situation?

Mr. KING. I am afraid that is the situation, although I would not want to state that definitely. With respect to the northern part of Russia that is my information; that is, that a defensive course only will be pursued. I sincerely hope the allied governments will not abandon the Czechoslovaks. I think it would be an act of cowardice. I can not find a strong enough term to characterize an act of such infamy and cowardice.

Mr. THOMAS. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I have no desire to be considered as advocating the abandonment of any nation, great or small, that could have been considered as an allied power in this conflict. The only thing that has confused me with reference to this situation was how we were going to accomplish anything other than the physical fact of the protection of stores by our military forces in Russia.

I do not agree with the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] that you can deal with the Bolshevik situation in a military way. It is one of those things that, in my judgment, can not be controlled by outside military force. In the first place, I should think it would be very confusing for a man in Russia to be able to distinguish upon all occasions a Bolshevik from a Russian. It is easy enough here in the Senate to speak of the Russians and the Bolsheviks, but if I were going out to kill a Bolshevik, in all probability I would kill just as many Russians as Bolsheviks. I would not be able to distinguish the Russians which were Bolsheviks and those which were not.

We are dealing with a situation in which nothing can be achieved from a military standpoint. On the other hand, no one knows to what extent what is called the Bolshevik government is accepted by the Russian people.

The trouble is, Mr. President, that we can not get the real facts. The people who come from Russia, who have seen, and have recorded in their own way the facts with reference to that country are not permitted to tell the story. Men have come back from Russia who have spent months in that country, who have a feeling that we do not understand the situation; that all the facts with reference to the soviet government have not been given; that the Russian people very largely support the soviet government; but they are not permitted to state the facts to the American people. Therefore it is almost impossible to deal with the situation here. We do not know to what extent the soviet government represents the Russian people. I take the

position that the Russian people have the same right to establish a socialistic state as we have to establish a Republic.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I hope the Senator will not call the soviet government or the Bolshevik government a socialistic government. While I have no sympathy with socialism, socialism, as I understand the term, is as far above Bolshevism as the heavens are above the earth. Bolshevism is madness and destruction, it is murder and assassination. It is a negation of everything. Socialism does speak for order. I am speaking of purified socialism, such as—

Mr. BORAH. You are giving your kind of socialism?

Mr. KING. No; I am speaking of what might be denominated orthodox or true socialism, the creed of Marx, and what has been called the purified socialism of Schaffle. I do not have in mind the teachings of Berger or those who under the guise of socialism have attempted to destroy government, and who have been traitors to our country in its war against Germany. Genuine, orthodox socialism does have some merit; but Bolshevism stands out condemned by God, and man, and even by hell itself.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Idaho is not familiar with that region. He has no communication with it.

Mr. KING. If the Senator knows anything about Bolshevism, he has.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I know how earnestly the Senator from Utah feels about the matter. If he will confine his idea of Bolshevism to Lenin and Trotsky I will agree with him. I think they are disloyal to every one on earth except themselves. I have no doubt they went into that country through the influence and protection and as corrupt representatives of the German Government. But I disassociate those two men and the few men who surround and support them from the great body and mass of Russian people. Even though those people be supporting them in a measure at this time, even though they recognize them as leaders at this time, I believe you can not bring an indictment against the whole people. There is a vast amount of good in the Russian people which may be properly organized and brought into order, and a sane and stable government be established. I am not willing to place, in other words, the standard which Lenin and Trotsky have raised as the standard which represents the intelligence or the capacity of the Russian people. I have great faith that they are yet to prove that they are the worthy and estimable people we have always believed them to be.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KIRBY. Is it the Senator's theory that we should reorganize the Russian Government and establish a government there according to our ideas?

Mr. BORAH. No, sir. I do not want this Government to go into Europe to set up governments.

Mr. KIRBY. Should we overthrow the Government that they are recognizing as authoritative? That is what I want to get at.

Mr. BORAH. If the Senator desires to know my exact position, I want to get out of Russia and let Russia settle her own affairs, so far as military intervention is concerned, just as soon as we can do so, with due deference to the military situation which has been superinduced by this war. If we ever go into Russia to set up a government by force we will leave millions of our boys in nameless graves, bankrupt our Treasury, and in the end come out something as Napoleon did.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Does the Senator know how many hundreds of thousands of Germans are still left in what was formerly Russia, and how many there are in Russia to-day through whose influence was probably brought about the condition that exists and has been made possible?

Mr. BORAH. I do not know how many are there. I have no doubt a number are there, and they are doing the same thing in Russia that they are now doing in Germany. They are superinducing and bringing on chaos. I have no doubt about that.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I will thank the Senator to permit me to make just one other suggestion. It was one of the 14 principles, as I conceive it, that the Germans should leave Russia and all other invaded territory under the terms of the armistice, and can we shift all the responsibility by saying that she can turn loose half a million Germans in Russia for the purpose of running amuck in the world as bad as she did when she started the war?

Mr. BORAH. That brings up another proposition. If that is the reason for our being there, if we believe that Germany has such a hold upon Russia that we must deal with Germany through the Russian territory, does anybody expect to whip Germany in Russia with 5,000 or 10,000 troops? That is the difficulty of the whole situation. If we have a task there to



perform, we have no one with whom to perform it; but the poor fellows who are there are suffering and dying without any particular object in view and without any hope of accomplishing anything.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I should like to ask the Senator if he has formed any conclusion from his investigation of this matter as to who is responsible for this situation, particularly as to whether this action in Russia on the one hand and inaction on the other, this indecisive course of proceeding, is due to any law of Congress, and if not, to what is it due? Who directed it and who is responsible to the American people for it?

Mr. BORAH. As I said a few moments ago, I understood from the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] that they were sent over to protect certain stores and certain bases, under the direction and order of Gen. Foch, and with that I have no fault to find. It was a part of the military strategy of the war.

They desired to organize an eastern front and to bring about a condition which would compel the Germans to divide their forces. Certainly I would be far from criticizing that course. That has nothing to do with the present situation, however, because we have ceased fighting in Germany. We are at peace with Germany. The treaty has not been signed, but we are no longer fighting, although we are killing these people in Russia. That is confusing to a man who has no more information to-day than I have.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I notice that the press dispatches, with apparent reliability, state that the British and French Governments have been endeavoring to secure from the United States some declaration of policy in regard to what the United States is going to do in Russia, and stating that their view is that we apparently have no policy at all.

Mr. BORAH. And they have not, either.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Oh, but they have. According to these dispatches they have a policy in regard to Russia and have been endeavoring to cooperate with the United States. I am only basing my statement upon public press dispatches, but I noticed, following upon the statement that they were unable to get any declaration of policy from the United States, a statement from the Government of Great Britain, made to the soldiers of their returning armies who desired to be demobilized and who are opposed to the beginning of what they term a new war, that the British Government will not send any additional troops to Russia, which, of course, means that as soon as possible they are going to bring out of Russia those they have already sent there. They seem to have a definite policy, but the dispatches coming from those Governments are to the effect that they have been unable to ascertain from the United States what we propose to do.

Mr. BORAH. The dispatches of which the Senator speaks did not seem to me to outline any policy upon the part of our allies; but here is where the difficulty arises: There is now being considered this policy or this program as to whether or not we will go into Russia and undertake to restore order and establish a stable government by force or whether we will simply confine our activities to the protection of the stores and to the stabilizing of the situation so as to protect whatever property we have there. The former proposition of going into Russia and establishing a sane and stable government, of interfering in the internal affairs of Russia, is one thing to which I would not, if I were consulted, give my consent.

The reason why, in my judgment, the able Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] and others are so much interested in this subject is because we are of the opinion that there is no disposition to limit these activities to the mere question of protecting the military situation which is brought on by reason of the war, but there is a disposition to go there and, as a very distinguished ex-President still living said, "shoot Bolshevism out of Russia."

In 1791 Mr. Pitt, of England, thought that they could shoot the revolutionary spirit out of France, and Edmund Burke figured that they could strangle it. Both of those distinguished statesmen were in favor of dealing with it purely from the military standpoint. They denounced it in terms scarcely less graphic or less pointed than the able Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] uses in his denunciation of Bolshevism. They said it was spreading the world over and would destroy all the stable governments. But they could not put it down by force. In their own fearful way the French people finally settled the mat-

ter among themselves and established through long years a Republic. It is worth all it cost. It has stood for four bloody years between civilization and barbarism. Robespierre and Marat were vicious and brutal, but the French people were a noble people. Whatever we think of Lenine and Trotsky, the Russian people are a noble people, and I venture to hope that even in travail and anguish they, too, will work out their salvation. If we are going to help the Russian people, let us not delude ourselves that we can help them by force of arms. Have we caught the Prussian disease, that we can think of nothing but force?

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, I wish to suggest to the Senator from Idaho that I read an interesting article a day or two ago in one of the newspapers—I can not now recall what paper it was—which suggested that one of the main reasons now for entering with our military forces into Russia was the appointment of a receiver for that Government in order that Great Britain, the United States, and France might collect about \$10,000,000,000 of claims held against the Russian Government and the Russian people.

Mr. NELSON obtained the floor.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KIRBY in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the Senator from New York.

MEMORIAL EXERCISES FOR THE LATE EX-PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Out of order, I ask unanimous consent to submit a concurrent resolution and that it be read and properly referred.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and the resolution will be read.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 28) was read and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Sunday, the 9th day of February, 1919, be set aside as the day upon which there shall be held a joint session of the Senate and the House of Representatives for appropriate exercises in commemoration of the life, character, and public service of the late Theodore Roosevelt, former President of the United States, Vice President of the United States, and President of the Senate.*

That a joint committee, to consist of five Senators and seven Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Vice President and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, shall be named, with full power to make all arrangements and publish a suitable program for the joint session of Congress herein authorized, and to issue the invitations hereinafter mentioned.

That invitations shall be extended to the President of the United States, the members of the Cabinet, the Chief Justice and Associate Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, and such other invitations shall be issued as to the said committee shall seem best.

That all expenses incurred by the committee in the execution of the provisions of this resolution shall be paid, one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives.

Mr. SMOOT. Will the Senator from Minnesota yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. NELSON. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I have already polled the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate upon the concurrent resolution, and I am authorized to report it favorably and to ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

Mr. NELSON. The unfinished business has already been laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unfinished business was formally laid before the Senate at 2 o'clock.

#### AFFAIRS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, I propose briefly to discuss the Russian situation from an impersonal point of view. In order that we may understand exactly what it is, I shall go back and partially trace the history of the war and of the two revolutions that have occurred in Russia.

The question is asked, Why have we not helped Russia, and why do we not help her now with military forces, in conjunction with the allies, to establish law and order and a stable government?

To answer this question properly it is necessary to point out in what condition the war with Germany left Russia, to point out her present condition and what has already been done for her relief, and to briefly outline how and in what manner regeneration must come to her.



Russia entered the great war in August, 1914, apparently with a whole heart and united purpose, both on the part of the Government and the people. During the continuance of the war she scored great successes and sad failures, and it was apparent that the failures came, in the main, not from any lack of fighting ability on the part of the officers and men of her armies but from the neglect of those in high authority, who had the power, but not the will, to furnish the armies with the necessary supplies of food, ammunition, and equipment.

Germany carried on a double system of warfare against Russia—one by her trained armies in the field, the other by an army of spies and emissaries of bribery and corruption. She found an ample field for these spies and emissaries among the radical socialists and the remnants of the old nihilists; but beyond this, and fully as dangerous, was the disguised treachery that prevailed in the purlieus and environment of the court, and among some of the higher officials of German origin, and whose sympathies were with Germany.

The Czar was a weakling, the Czarina was a German, and both came under the sinister influence of the Monk Rasputin, who was evidently a tool of Germany, and aided in carrying on the German propaganda for the termination of the war and a separate peace.

One of the methods pursued by the plotters was to tighten the strings of autocracy so that they might the more easily break. At the direct instance of Prime Minister Goremykin, the Czar was induced to prorogue the Duma—the Russian Congress—at a time when this body was loyally supporting the war and was only asking for a responsible ministry and an amnesty for political offenders.

Proroguing the Duma led to the resignation of Goremykin, but he was succeeded by Boris Sturmer, a man of German blood and sympathy and a friend and associate of Rasputin. Sturmer soon began operations secretly and by roundabout methods to secure separate peace with Germany, and with this in view he brought about the removal of Sazonov, the minister of foreign affairs, a thorough friend of the allies, and he continued to still further tighten the strings of autocracy and to pursue his peace propaganda by securing the appointment of Protopopoff as minister of the interior. Shortly after this Sturmer, on account of corruption in office, was forced to resign, and he in turn was succeeded by Trepov, who was a weak man and never cut much of a figure.

The controlling spirit in the ministry after Sturmer was the minister of the interior, Protopopoff, who began an insidious campaign by drastic means to foment trouble and disturbance and to bring on a revolution for the purpose of furthering his sinister peace program. The Czarina and Rasputin were in league with him and held the poor Czar in their toils.

In the meantime the baleful influence of Rasputin had become so pronounced and acute that it was deemed necessary, by those who were really friendly to the Czar and hostile to the German influence and propaganda, to do away with him once for all, and he was accordingly lured to the house of a member of the royal family and there killed at the instance of a group of men who had assembled there for that purpose. His body was put under the ice in the River Neva, but was afterwards recovered. All this proved a great shock to the Czarina, Protopopoff, and the other members of the court who were friendly to Germany, and the remains of Rasputin were in fact given a quasi royal funeral.

It was hoped that the German influence with the court and Government would subside with the death of Rasputin, but the German intrigues continued, and Protopopoff seemed to step into the shoes of Rasputin, and proceeded to remove from the Government all those who were not friendly to Germany. Through his secret agents he fomented strikes and then proceeded to arrest the labor leaders, who were preaching and working against strikes. Then he halted and retarded the trains that were bringing food supplies to Petrograd to such an extent that not only the workmen but the troops suffered for want of food. He wanted dire distress to prevail in order to make it easier to come to terms with Germany to end the war and to secure peace; but his methods and his work brought on the upheaval and revolution of March, 1917, which led to the abdication of the Czar and the establishment of the Kerensky Government.

Up to this time the war against Germany had proceeded with varied successes and failures, but I will not weary you with any details of this. It is sufficient to say that aside from the bad generalship of the Tannenberg campaign, the Russians were, in the main, successful when they were provided with ample supplies of food, ammunition, and equipment. It was only where these failed that the Russians were forced to retreat, with empty

guns and cannon, coupled with a lack of food. This failure to supply the army with food and ammunition was a part of the baleful and sinister German propaganda, participated in and promoted by high officials of the Russian Government.

The Russian officers and soldiers were brave men, and their heart was in the war, but they could not stem the tide of invasion with empty stomachs and empty rifles. Their heroic retreat, under these conditions, can not but meet with our sympathy and admiration for their valor and endurance.

One of the first acts of the Kerensky government was to pardon all political offenders at home and abroad. This brought Lenine from Siberia and Trotzky from the United States, to whom I shall refer later.

The Kerensky government proceeded to carry on the war, and at first was partly successful, but soon found itself handicapped by a spirit of the most radical socialism, which not only possessed the workmen and peasants but had also entered the ranks of the army to such an extent that the rank and file insisted on the right to remove and appoint their officers, high and low. This, of course, would inevitably lead to the disintegration of the army.

Nikolai Lenine, whose real name is Vladimir Utulyanov, had returned from Siberia by way of Switzerland and Germany in April, 1917, and at once proceeded to denounce the provisional government of Kerensky and the allies and to advocate a separate and immediate peace. He was thorough and through of the most radical order of socialists, and he no doubt obtained his cue in Germany on his way from Switzerland. He had an aggressive helper and coadjutor in Leon Trotzky, whose real name is Leber Braunstein and who had returned from America, where he had resided for some time and was known as a most radical and extreme socialist. The agitation of these two and that of their associates so affected the army that the Russian soldiers began to fraternize with the enemy soldiers, to desert, and to leave for home, and even in time of battle refuse to fight and go over to the enemy. This brought on a collapse of the war.

In the meantime Germany and Austria continued to vigorously prosecute the war and to press the Russian Army farther and farther back—back to a line running from Riga by way of Smorgon, Pinsk, Lutsk, Tarnopol, Czernowitz to Galatz, near the mouth of the Danube.

While the Russian armies were being pressed farther and farther back for lack of leaders and of a warlike spirit, Lenine and Trotzky and their associates and followers, who had assumed or acquired the name of "Bolsheviki," vigorously pursued their peace propaganda, and with that end in view sought to undermine and destroy the Kerensky government. In this they were soon successful, and in November, 1917, the Kerensky government was overthrown and was succeeded by a Bolshevik Government under the lead of Lenine and Trotzky, who announced their program, through Trotzky to a representative of the Associated Press, to be, among other matters, an offer of an immediate armistice on all fronts for the conclusion of a democratic peace, transfer of all lands to the peasants, State control of industries, and delivery of all authority to local soldiers and workmen's deputies. Lenine further announced that he and his government were for immediate peace without annexation and without indemnities.

Trotsky in the meantime sought to get the allies to join him in his armistice and peace propaganda. In this he, of course, failed.

During these maneuvers on the part of Lenine and Trotzky there had been a 10 days' suspension of hostilities. This was succeeded by an armistice to extend from December 17, 1917, until January 14, 1918. In the meantime sinister negotiations continued between the Bolshevik government and the representatives of Germany and Austria, but I will not weary you with the details of these. It is sufficient to state that they all culminated in the treaty of Brest-Litovsk.

Before calling your attention to some of the provisions of this treaty, I will bring your attention to some other important matters which serve to explain some of the provisions of this treaty.

During this period of revolutions and the collapse of the war, Germany had embarked on a plan of establishing a kingdom of Finland, with a German prince as king, and she had also been instrumental in bringing forth and nursing a so-called Ukraine republic, to be independent of Russia. This last-mentioned scheme was the most sinister, and would prove the most destructive to the future welfare of Russia.

The proposed Ukraine nation or republic was to include 17 Provinces of Russia lying north of the Black Sea and the Sea of Azov, and watered by the Rivers Dneister, Dnieper, Don, and their tributaries. It embraces an area of over 300,000 square

miles and constitutes the best agricultural portion of European Russia, the famous black belt. It is also the home and the heart of the great Slavic race. To deprive Russia of this vast and rich domain would be to wrench her very vitals from her, and render impotent and abortive her future rehabilitation.

In addition to these matters, Germany was also nursing a scheme to cut off the Baltic Provinces of Russia, namely, Courland, Livonia, Esthonia, and Lithuania, with a view of establishing some kind of independent governments for them or perhaps, which is more probable, of ultimately absorbing them into the German Empire.

Peace negotiations were opened at Brest-Litovsk, between the Bolshevik government of Lenine and Trotzky on the one part and Germany, Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey on the other part in December, 1917, but were postponed and continued on various grounds until March 3, 1918, when the final treaty was signed, which was afterwards accepted by the so-called Pan Soviet Congress at Moscow on March 14, 1918. By this treaty Russia was divested of Finland, Esthonia, Livonia, Courland, Lithuania, Poland, Ukraine, and Russian Armenia. In short, her northern, southern, southeastern, and western borders were all stripped. She was cut off from the Black Sea, with a mere look-in at the easternmost end of the Gulf of Finland, and remitted for sea outlets to Vladivostok, Archangel, and the Kola Peninsula. The greater and most serious of these territorial losses, the Ukraine, seems to have been cheerfully acquiesced in by the Bolshevik representatives.

When Chairman Kuhlman at the peace conference inquired of Trotzky whether he and his associates desired to represent diplomatically Russia as a whole, Trotzky replied:

Being informed of the note of the general secretary of the Ukrainian people's Republic, which has been communicated by the Ukrainian delegation, the Russia delegation, for its part, declares that, acting in full recognition of the principles of the right of self-definition for every nation, it finds no objection to the participation of the Ukrainian delegation in the peace negotiations, even if this should involve the complete secession of the latter from Russia.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SHAFROTH in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I understood the Senator's preceding sentence to indicate that the Bolsheviks cheerfully consented to a dismemberment of Ukraine from Russia and the setting up under self-determination of an independent government. Is it not a fact, however, that later the Bolsheviks attempted, and are now attempting, to destroy all forms of government and of order in the Ukraine, the same as they are trying to destroy it in Esthonia, in Courland, or in Finland, and indicate that they are going to invade the entire world and destroy government wherever it does exist?

Mr. NELSON. I have not any doubt about that.

In the light of and inspired by this suggestion, which I have just quoted of Trotzky, a separate treaty was made with the Ukraine representatives who were in attendance at the peace treaty. I need not go into other details of the Russian treaty of Brest-Litovsk than to say that it bears the clear earmarks of the fact that Trotzky and Lenine and the other leaders of the Bolshevik government were wholly oblivious to the welfare and best interests of Russia and were evidently the conscious tools of Germany. In any event the most charitable view that can be taken of their conduct is that they were so eager to establish a most radical and thorough socialistic state that they were willing to sacrifice all other vital essentials and interests for that purpose. If they were not financially corrupt, they were certainly morally and mentally corrupt, and poor Russia was the main sufferer and chief victim.

The peace propaganda of Germany in Russia has proved more fatal than her war propaganda. The germ of Bolshevism was imported and, in the first instance, insidiously nursed and spread by Germany. The strife on the battle field has long since ceased, but the strife engendered by the invasion of spies and emissaries of treachery, fraud, and corruption is still rampant and a festering sore.

Conditions are still chaotic and mob rule seems still rampant. Russia has had and still needs relief and help, and the allies have already done much to help her. First and foremost of all they have vanquished and brought to her knees the enemy of Russia, and that common enemy of the civilized world—Germany—and through that has relieved Russia from the burden of the treaty of Brest-Litovsk, which is now a dead letter; and the large quantity of gold money taken by Germany from Russia has been recovered by the allies, and is held by them in trust for the Russian people. They have opened to her the ports of the Black Sea and given her an outlet to the Mediterranean

and have recovered for her from the enemy her fleet in that sea.

With Odessa and Sevastopol and the shores of the Black Sea in control of the allies, the people of the Ukraine will soon see the folly of separating from the rest of Russia, and the Ukraine Republic, breathed into life by Germany, will soon be a mere saga.

The ports on the Baltic and the Gulf of Finland, namely, Riga, Pernau, Reval, Kronstadt, Helsingfors, and the Aland Islands, are fast being cleared of the enemy, and the interned Russian fleet in those waters will soon be recovered, and the German fleet will no longer be a menace. The port of Vladivostok, on the Pacific; the port of Arkangel, on the White Sea; and the port of Alexandria, on the Murman coast; and the Kola Peninsula, with all the shipping supplies and ammunition in those ports, have been saved and conserved for the benefit of the Russian people.

On the west—as a shield against Germany—a new Poland is fast rising from the turmoils and afflictions of the past, to regain the place she once held among the nations of the Old World, with a port at Danzig or Königsberg giving her an outlet to the sea.

All these matters which I have thus briefly enumerated have been and will be of great help for the restoration and regeneration of Russia; but regeneration must come from within and not through the sword of an outsider, however friendly he may be.

Already the anti-Bolshevik elements have obtained control of nearly all of Siberia and the Siberian railroads as far west as Omsk in western Siberia, and by the very latest accounts as far west as Perm, across the Ural Mountains in the eastern part of European Russia.

In the Ukraine, the Bolsheviks are fast losing their grip, and I think from there and from Siberia will come the elements and forces that will ultimately vanquish the Bolshevik government and bring order out of chaos.

The Bolshevik government can no longer lean upon Germany or receive material support from there, and all the civilized world is opposed to the system and methods of this government. It will be an Ishmaelite among the enlightened nations of the world, and soon the mass of the Russian people will become weary and sigh and labor for something better.

I have great faith in the recuperative vitality of the Russian people. They have always, in the past, succeeded in recovering themselves from what seemed hopeless adversity and chaos. I have acquired this faith from scanning the past history of the race.

The origin of the Slav race is somewhat obscure. When first known to history, the Russian Slavs, consisting of several tribes, occupied the territory extending from the region of the lower Danube, thence northward along the Rivers Dniester and Dnieper to Lake Ladoga on the north.

There was much strife among the various tribes, and finally in the ninth century some of the leading northern tribes invited Ruric, a Scandinavian chief, who with his followers had previously invaded the country from the north by way of the Neva and Lake Ladoga, to come to rule and lead them. He came, and under him and his successors the several tribes gradually coalesced and expanded their possessions in a northerly, easterly, and southeasterly direction and assumed the form of a nation and a homogeneous people.

Novgorod, on the River Volkhov, north of Lake Ilmen, was the first capital. From there Ruric and his successors proceeded southward to Smolensk and Kiev, and the latter place became for a while the capital of the embryo State, but Moscow ultimately became the seat of the Empire.

Christianity as well as culture came to them from the Greeks of the Byzantine Empire at Constantinople.

Many vicissitudes and many drawbacks were encountered by the new State, which, however, were gradually overcome; but the greatest calamity which befell the country was the great Mongol or Tartar invasion which began near the close of the thirteenth century and continued intermittently for upward of 200 years. During the confusion which ensued the chief band of cohesion was the church, which remained uncontaminated and was the chief rallying ground. The metropolitan had in the meantime transferred his see and seat to Moscow.

By the latter part of the fifteenth century the Tartar invasion had been stopped and ceased, and internal dissensions which had prevailed were suppressed and terminated, and Ivan the Third assumed the title of autocrat of all Russia and proceeded to consolidate and expand the Empire.

The Slav race had overcome the invasions, the vicissitudes, and the confusion of centuries and had emerged as a strong nation imbued with the spirit of expansion and growth.



Vassil the Third succeeded his father, Ivan the Third, and was succeeded by his son, Ivan the Fourth, known to history as Ivan the Terrible, who assumed the title of Tsar, and who, in many respects, was the greatest prince of the line of Ruric, and who further consolidated and enlarged the empire, extending it to the Ural Mountains and Caspian Sea. In his latter years the spirit of cruelty got the better of him and in a rage he killed his oldest son. He died in 1584, after a long reign, in which he had greatly enlarged, expanded, and consolidated his empire.

Three years before Ivan died the noted Yermak, at the head of his Cossacks, had entered upon the conquest of Siberia, which was pursued with such vigor by his successors that within 50 years thereafter the Russians had reached the shores of the Pacific at Kamchatka and Bering Strait and had, in the meantime, crossed three mighty rivers—the Ob, the Yenisei, the Lena, and their chief tributaries.

The death of Ivan brought on a collapse of the Government and the end of the rule of the line of Ruric. A period of disintegration, confusion, and chaos set in. Several pretenders appeared in the meantime and had many followers. The situation was more chaotic and more hopeless than it is to-day. For a time there was not even the semblance of a government of any kind, but finally, after the lapse of some 28 years of turmoil and confusion, the Russian people recovered themselves, and by the aid of the church placed Michael Romanoff on the throne, who succeeded, by the aid of the church and the better elements of the Russian people, in restoring law and order and in establishing a stable Government.

Under him and his successors the Russian Empire has continued to grow and expand into a mighty nation, although handicapped by its oriental origin and its lack of the general diffusion of knowledge. Serfdom, which had become established by custom and had retarded the progress of the Russian peasants, was finally abolished in the latter half of the nineteenth century, and Siberia and the shores of the Pacific were in the early part of this century united to European Russia by the great Siberian Railroad.

The descendants of Michael Romanoff continued at the head of the Russian Government until the revolution of 1917, to which I have already brought your attention.

I have thus briefly called your attention to and dwelt upon these two noted events in Russian history, namely, the Tartar invasion and the chaotic chasm which intervened between the extinction of the house of Ruric and the advent of the house of Romanoff, for the purpose of bringing your attention to the recuperative vitality of the Russian people.

A people who under such adverse conditions and drawbacks as then prevailed could thus recover themselves and expand and grow into a mighty empire have certainly the innate force, vigor, and vitality to restore order and to again establish a stable government.

The Bolsheviki government of Lenine and Trotsky without the aid of Germany, which it had when it was first launched, and without help or recognition from any outside source, and cut off from access to the sea at all points, can not long survive. It is based on false economic principles and is in the hands of treacherous, unscrupulous, and corrupt leaders. It is a moral excrescence which will inevitably slough off. The Russian people will soon by their own efforts come to their own. It will not be the old-time autocracy—they are scarcely fit for a republic—but a limited monarchy, with a legislature elected by manhood suffrage and a responsible ministry, after the pattern of England or the Scandinavian countries, would furnish them a stable government, suitable for their condition and their intelligence; and such a government, by the aid and encouragement of the allies, I believe they will establish in the near future, without the aid of outside military forces.

#### REPEAL OF ESPIONAGE ACT.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, this morning I introduced a bill to repeal the so-called espionage act and the act amendatory thereof, and I desire to submit a few observations upon that subject.

On the 3d day of last December the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], one of the ablest and staunchest champions in the Senate of free speech, of a free press, and of full publicity in connection with the business of the Government, introduced a bill to repeal that portion of the espionage act which empowers the Postmaster General to exercise his discretion as to publications which should be admitted to the United States mail. I find myself in entire sympathy with the measure offered by the Senator from Idaho; indeed, I had for some time contemplated introducing a bill to repeal this whole act. The enactment of the espionage law was, in my judgment, unnecessary, unjustifiable, unconstitutional, and a usurpation of power by the Congress under the direction of an executive department of the

Government. The enactment of this legislation seemed to me at the time to be a direct affront to the people of this Republic.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. FRANCE. I yield.

Mr. KING. The Senator will recall that upon a number of occasions Congress has committed to the Postmaster General the discretion to exclude from the mails obscene matter, matter criminal in character, lottery matter, and so forth. Does the Senator think that committing to the Postmaster General the discretion to refuse the use of the mails to literature of that kind was unconstitutional?

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I have a great regard for the Senator from Utah, as he knows. I only desire to speak very briefly, but I shall endeavor in the remarks which I intend to present to make my opinion perfectly clear to everybody.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that the answer just made is a full and fair reply to the question which I have propounded, and is it the only reply the Senator cares to make?

Mr. FRANCE. I think that the language of the Constitution is very clear, and I think it is beyond dispute that the States, in language as plain and definite as could be written, reserved to themselves the right to legislate with reference to the freedom of the press and the freedom of speech.

Mr. President, I do not hesitate to say that when the enactment of such legislation as this is no longer resented by the American people, and when such a serious invasion of their inalienable rights shall not be summarily punished at a subsequent election by the repudiation of the party in power responsible for it, then, indeed, will the end of this great enterprise and experiment in free government upon this continent be not far distant.

The people of the United States bore this invasion of their rights with patience. It was not because of but in spite of such legislation as this that more than 20,000,000 of our people brought their savings, many of them taking upon themselves unaccustomed debts and obligations in order that they might buy the bonds, without which the preservation of our liberty would have been impossible. It was not because of but in spite of such legislation that there could scarcely be found within the confines of this great Republic a humble cottage or a stately mansion in which there did not hang a food-conservation card, a liberty bond emblem, a cross of red, or a black or golden star of unselfish service and of supreme sacrifice. I feel confident that there were many Members of the Congress who supported this legislation because under the extraordinary conditions they deemed it to be their duty, for the sake of harmony of action, to waive their own better judgment, even at the cost of following for a time a blind and reactionary leadership; but I fear that there were also those who voted for this legislation because they had lost faith in the Republic and in the love of the millions of our people for our country and their loyalty under all circumstances to her free institutions.

I was one of a small minority of Senators who voted against the passage of this espionage act. Minorities are generally mistaken. Surely, in view of the clear constitutional provision and of the extraordinary conditions which then prevailed, there was ample room for a legitimate difference of opinion. A large minority, made up chiefly of those on this side of the Chamber, contended for an amendment which would have assured the American people that, even after the enactment of this drastic law, they would be protected in their right to speak or publish "what is true, from good motives and for justifiable ends." But even this amendment, after it had been adopted once by the Senate, was stricken out upon what amounted to a peremptory order from an official in an executive department. But whatever room there might have been at the time this legislation was enacted for legitimate differences of opinion, I personally can not see how there should now be any difference between us as to the wisdom and, indeed, the necessity for its prompt repeal.

Now, as never before in our history, as we face momentous questions, and as we are approaching the time when we must consider treaties which may fix the obligations of our country to other nations for generations to come, are the absolute freedom of the press and fearlessness and freedom of speech and discussion indispensable.

I shall not now enter upon a prolonged discussion of this subject of a free press and of free speech. Yesterday a Nation stricken and bereaved mourned at the bier of him who had the courage of his convictions, whose heroic deeds made realities of his high ideals; and last night by many a hearthstone strong men and weeping women knelt down to pray that since Theodore Roosevelt's mighty spirit has been summoned to a higher sphere there may be raised up new champions to plead with his fearlessness and power for the restoration of the people's rights



as against this tyrannical executive oligarchy which we, with the best of motives, have permitted to usurp them.

If there be any timorous one, I would commend to him the immortal words of the Areopagitica of Milton:

Though all the winds of doctrine were let loose to play upon the earth, so truth be in the field we do injuriously by licensing and prohibiting to misdoubt her strength. Let her and falsehood grapple; whoever knew truth put to the worse in a free and open encounter? What a collusion is this, when as we are exhorted by the wise Man to use diligence, to seek for wisdom as for hidden treasures, early and late, that another Order shall enjoin us to know nothing but by statute.

I would that such a trembling one might become imbued with the spirit of Jefferson and with his faith in the Republic as revealed in his inaugural address, March 4, 1801, when he said:

If there be any among us who wish to dissolve this Union or to change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated, where reason is left free to combat it.

He was, of course, referring only to errors of opinion, and not to disloyalty and criminality of action, which, of course, can and should be punished under statutes which did before exist and which will remain in force after the espionage act has been repealed.

For myself, I shall contend here for an absolute freedom of speech and of the press, for full publicity in connection with the business of the Government, for a diplomacy absolutely open at every stage to the public view, for an immediate release from the clutch of a reactionary administration of the cables, the telegraph and telephone systems, the myriad swinging wires of which, like the tenuous web of association fibers within the brain of man, make possible that communication, association, and comparison of thought and ideas which compose the common public mind, the all but infallible conclusions of which, when its processes are undisturbed, are wise beyond the wisdom of any man and are the nearest approach in this sphere of many limitations to the absolute reason and wisdom of the Deity.

Referring to this question of free speech and of a free press, to the question of secret diplomacy, to which this administration seems, contrary to its many professions, to be committed, to the questions of the consideration of treaties behind closed doors, and of that rather suspicious secretiveness on the part of those who are dealing, it seems to me destructively rather than constructively, with the complex problem of our relations with Russia, I would call your attention to the words spoken by Lord Northcliffe at Paris recently:

Nothing can be worse for the prospects of the coming conference than an atmosphere of secrecy and half truths.

And we have been hearing some half truths to-day, Mr. President, from the State Department.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. FRANCE. I yield, with pleasure.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that the statement he has just made is entirely fair? The Senator will take into account the fact that we have been, and still are, at war with the greatest military government of all times. The Senator knows that one of the first obligations resting upon a country at war is, so far as it may be done, to prevent the enemy from obtaining information as to the plans of his opponents. Does the Senator think—

Mr. FRANCE. Ah, Mr. President, I have heard that argument before.

Mr. KING. May I complete my sentence? If the Senator objects, I shall be glad to take my seat.

Mr. FRANCE. I do not object, of course.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that there was anything improper in Gen. Foch and the military staff failing to disclose to Germany or to the Bolsheviks their plan in sending troops to Russia? Does not the Senator think, in other words, that it was a proper and prudent thing to do not to disclose their military plans in sending troops not only to Siberia but to the White Sea?

Mr. FRANCE. Of course, the able Senator from Utah opens up a large subject, and it is difficult to know where to attack it, but I will attack it right here.

I listened with profound interest to the remarks—I believe the authoritative remarks—of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] this afternoon. I did not care to interrupt him, but if I had done so I would have asked him this question, which I now ask the Senator from Utah, who is an able lawyer: Was not Russia legally, when we invaded her territory, a neutral country? And if we invaded that neutral country in order to fight the Germans, as the Senator from Nebraska very clearly said to-day, what grievance can we justly urge against Germany because she had invaded helpless Belgium to fight the French and English? I think both of these invasions were inexcusable, and I also believe that there was no authority existing to send American troops to invade Russia until that authority was given

by the Congress of the United States, into whose hands the fathers very wisely committed the decision of the momentous questions as to whether we should enter upon war; and it was largely because that very function of declaring war had not been securely lodged in the representative chambers of Germany that we called Germany an autocracy. Now, either the Senator must contend that Russia was not neutral territory, that we did not invade her to fight Germany, that it is no war to march troops for belligerent purposes onto a foreign soil, or he must see the impropriety of the whole procedure.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator intended me to reply to the interrogation which culminated in a speech which was just submitted. If so, I shall be very happy to submit in a few words at least an attempt to reply to the question.

Mr. FRANCE. I shall be very glad to have the Senator do so, although I know that the Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] has some very important observations to submit upon a most important subject, and I had assured him that I would not take over 15 minutes. In fact, I thought the remarks which I had intended to make would scarcely consume more than 10 minutes. If the Senator from New York does not object, I think it would be only fair to allow the Senator from Utah to answer some of those questions, and I hope he does so upon the authority of the administration.

Mr. KING. I do not want to intrude upon the Senator from Maryland, nor upon my good friend the Senator from New York. I shall be very happy, however, to reply to the questions of the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. FRANCE. I hope the Senator from Utah will explain this to me most unexplainable and inexcusable action at some future time, because I think it will require even his great ability as a lawyer—for which I have the highest admiration—to defend such an act and the men responsible for it. I do not hesitate to say, right here, that I hope the Senator has had some experience in criminal law, if he undertakes to defend that action.

Mr. KING. I would only need a knowledge of equity to defend that.

Mr. FRANCE. I will resume my quotation from Lord Northcliffe; and this is a question also which I should like the Senator from Utah to answer when he speaks in defense of this administration—the administrations, rather, because there are several of them in Europe which seem to be committed to a secret negotiation of these treaties of peace:

Shall the destinies of millions of people in all quarters of the globe be left to the tender mercies of a comparative handful of delegates, against whose enactments there is no public appeal? Such would be mockery of that principle of self-determination of free nations which has been fought for and won in this war.

And, again, in this connection, I would call your attention to the words of grand old Samuel Adams, who in his great defense of American independence, delivered on August 1, 1776, said:

Truth loves an appeal to the common sense of mankind. Your unperturbed understandings can best determine on subjects of a practical nature. The positions and plans which are said to be above the comprehension of the multitude may always be suspected to be visionary and fruitless. He who made all men hath made the truths necessary to human happiness obvious to all.

And I want to say that I know Maryland farmers, not acquainted with political life, who are more competent to pass upon some of these mysterious problems now being considered by the Department of State than some of the men who are in that department drawing large salaries, which these same farmers help to pay.

So spoke Adams and the other fathers. May we never lose their faith, either in times of peace or in periods of stress and war, in these principles which they enunciated, the great fundamental principles upon which are laid the everlasting foundations of this Republic.

I desire to give notice that I shall press, with whatever resources are at my command, the enactment of this repealing legislation. I trust that the Judiciary Committee may find an opportunity to report this bill favorably at a very early date, but I feel it to be my duty, whatever the action of the committee may be, to secure an early vote, in order that the attitude of the Senate upon this question may be determined.

In speaking as I have I have spoken for myself alone, and not for the Members upon this side of the Chamber. I have no doubt, however, that when this question shall come to a vote, a very large number of those upon this side of the Chamber will vote for the repeal of this espionage act. For if they did not do so, it seems to me that they would be violating the best traditions of our party, the party which has always been the great progressive, constructive, liberal party of the Republic.

Our party does not believe in democracy disorganized and disorderly. We have faith in the Republic so constituted that, if its public officers observe and obey that constitution, liberty is



insured to each citizen, and all are secured against every form of tyranny, even the tyranny of majorities over minorities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill introduced by the Senator from Maryland (Mr. FRANCE) will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### SHIP CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, the urgent deficiencies act of June 15, 1917, authorizes the President during the period of the war to requisition any existing or future contracts for the building, construction, or purchase of ships or material, and further authorizes him to confer upon the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation powers to carry out his orders in connection with the purchase, construction, and operation of all merchant vessels.

This act also provides that all authority granted to the President herein or by him delegated shall cease six months after the final treaty of peace is proclaimed between this Government and the German Empire. Under the terms of this and subsequent bills the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation have been authorized to expend nearly \$4,000,000,000. By the powers given them they have requisitioned ships under construction and have made contracts for the construction of steel, wooden, and concrete vessels of every sort. The fact that six months after peace is declared much of the power of the Emergency Fleet Corporation will cease has prompted me to address myself to the subject and to offer to the Senate some suggestions regarding this problem.

In considering the work of the Emergency Fleet Corporation up to the time of the signing of the armistice on November 11 last, it is necessary to take into consideration certain facts at the time work was started.

First. There were under construction or contracted for by private owners in American shipyards, some of these being British and Norwegian, over 400 steel ships of approximately 2,900,000 dead-weight tons. A very large proportion of these contracts were in yards on the Pacific coast. These ships were requisitioned by the Fleet Corporation and the deliveries made have been included in the total tonnage reports. They constitute two-thirds of the total delivered since the Fleet Corporation began operation. These ships would have been constructed without reference to the activities of the Fleet Corporation, but it is possible that their delivery has been hastened to some extent by the payment of bonuses for overtime and allowances for increases in wages paid.

Second. In addition to the well-developed shipyards on the Pacific coast, there were in operation a dozen or more yards on the Great Lakes. All of these yards were well organized and had regular forces of skilled ship workers. It was necessary only to expand and enlarge these yards for the increased output made necessary by the war. Approximately 96 per cent of the steel ships actually built and delivered under contracts made by the Fleet Corporation up to November 11 last have come from the Pacific coast and Great Lakes yards.

Third. Practically all of the established shipyards on the Atlantic seaboard were filled to capacity with Navy Department work or with a part of the private work contracted before the war.

Fourth. In order to put into construction the immense tonnage of new ships demanded by the war situation it was necessary to contract for the building of many new yards and to make contracts for ships with new and entirely inexperienced organizations, whose yards were still to be constructed.

Fifth. Facilities had in many cases to be provided or enlarged for the manufacture of machinery and special equipment required for the ships.

Sixth. Shipbuilding has not been one of the really great American industries. This meant that the supply of men for all branches of the work—mechanical, designing, and administrative—was very limited and that a large share of the contracts must be made with untrained organizations. Even this supply was cut down to a certain extent by the operation of the draft law.

With these facts in mind, an examination of the accompanying tabulations will give a clear understanding of the good and bad points of the work performed.

Several things are evident:

(1) The established yards, working on both requisitioned and contract steel ships, rendered excellent service and have practically fulfilled their delivery promises.

(2) The new yards which have been constructed for the building of steel ships have not been able to produce ships either rapidly or economically. In fact, their contribution in finished ships has been practically nothing and their costs of production exceedingly high. There have been a few exceptions to this where the builders were men of wide shipbuilding expe-

rience and utilized part of their trained organization to operate new yards.

(3) Entirely too much dependence was placed in wooden ships. The only possible justification for an extensive wood-ship program in these times was the belief in certain quarters that the ships, hundreds of them, could be built and put into operation in a few months after the signing of contracts. Contracts were made without proper investigation as to the responsibility of the contractors, their knowledge of the work, or the probable source of their supply of materials.

It was evident to any well-informed observer at the end of a few months that the wood-ship program must be a great disappointment. Nevertheless, contracts for more wood ships continued to be let. In the month of October, 1918, contracts were placed for 47 wood cargo ships of 197,500 dead-weight tonnage; a total of 731 wood cargo ships were contracted for, and so unsatisfactory were they that immediately upon the signing of the armistice contracts for 160 were canceled.

Experienced shipping men of the country from the very beginning insisted that the wooden-ship program could not hope to be of real value, and already the Shipping Board has offered these vessels for sale. They were never fit for overseas traffic. In fact, very early in the war, Mr. Homer Ferguson, president of the Newport News Shipbuilding Co. and reputed to be the best-informed shipbuilder in the country, stated before the Commerce Committee of the Senate that they could never be utilized permanently for overseas traffic.

Of the 92 that were accepted by the Government up to the time of the signing of the armistice, 2—the *Blackford* and the *Coos Bay*—have already sunk, and 10 others were compelled to lay up for repairs after a voyage of less than 1,000 miles. These wooden ships, unless disposed of by our Government, may be utilized for coastwise trade, but have little value outside of that. If the Government could sell them at 50 per cent of their cost, it would be an excellent bargain.

The contracts entered into by the Fleet Corporation were of several kinds, including lump-sum contracts for ships, cost-plus-fee contracts for ships, cost-plus-fee contracts for both yards and ships, and those which provided allowances of various kinds for plant extensions or other items of expense.

In practically all instances the contractors are protected against advances in wages and cost of material, both items being to a large extent controlled by the various governmental war boards.

This means that the actual cost of the ships under contract can not be determined in advance and will in nearly every case very largely exceed the estimates.

The very high prices paid for materials, the large wage increases allowed, the exceedingly small output of work per man, the cost of the many and varied social and industrial service activities fostered by the Fleet Corporation, and the necessity for charging off a very large part of the plant investment in these contracts have resulted in a total cost for these ships approximately three times that of similar ships in a normal prewar period and nearly five times the cost in British yards. In addition to these costs, there must be charged the expense of the Fleet Corporation's own activities and much of the money expended for housing and transportation facilities.

Contracts for approximately 35 per cent of the total tonnage of new steel ships were let on some form of cost-plus contract to five shipbuilding concerns, only one of which had previous experience in the work. These were as follows:

	Ships.	Dead-weight tons.
American International, Hog Island, Pa.....	180	1,385,000
Merchant Shipbuilding Corporation, Bristol, Pa.....	60	540,000
Submarine Boat Corporation, Newark, N. J.....	150	785,400
Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, five yards.....	111	783,400
Carolina Shipbuilding Corporation, Wilmington, N. C.....	12	115,200
Total.....	513	3,609,000

The total estimated cost of these ships, including cost of yard construction where that was a part of the contract, was approximately \$745,000,000.

The probable cost of these ships will be nearer \$1,000,000,000. This makes an average cost per dead-weight ton of approximately \$275, without the cost of supervision and control by the Fleet Corporation.

Of these 513 ships, only 4 had been delivered up to November 11, 1918, out of 103 promised by that date.

An analysis of the results obtained under the contracts with the American International Shipbuilding Corporation, the Merchant Shipbuilding Corporation, and the Submarine Boat Corporation is given in tables and notes attached hereto.

The Carolina Shipbuilding Corporation laid its first keel on November 2, and its work has not reached a point where analysis is possible.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. CALDER. I yield.

Mr. KING. I wish to inquire of the Senator whether the International Shipbuilding Co. is the one which was operating at Hog Island?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. KING. Does the cost which the Senator gave of \$275 per ton, dead-weight, include the fifty or sixty million dollars which the Hog Island plant cost, or is it exclusive of that?

Mr. CALDER. In my statement I averaged the cost of all the ships being constructed in the agency yards, and I include the cost of the yards. The ships being built at Hog Island will cost more than those being built at the other agency yards. Some of the ships being built there will cost over \$300 a ton. I will get to that in a moment, if the Senator will permit me. I have some figures dealing in detail with the costs at the Hog Island yard.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator give any information, in the course of his remarks, with reference to the comparative cost between ships built at Hog Island and other shipyards on the Atlantic coast and ships constructed on the Pacific coast?

Mr. CALDER. I have not in my remarks any such information, but I will say that the average price per dead-weight ton of steel ships throughout the country runs about \$180 a ton.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator mean exclusive of the cost of supervision of the yards by the Government?

Mr. CALDER. About \$185 is the cost on the Pacific coast.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. CALDER. I do.

Mr. FLETCHER. I should like to direct attention to the fact that it is quite impossible now to tell what the cost of the ships will be when there have been only two or three ships out of a total number of 120, for instance, contracted for. I think the Senator must be aware of the fact that we have not proceeded far enough yet to ascertain fully the cost per dead-weight ton of the ships that are under construction. It may be that a person can make a sort of an estimate about what one ship would cost, but as to the cost of a number of ships or the cost of all the ships under construction it is quite impossible to say what it will be.

I think the Senator can not produce sufficient data to show what the cost has been in the different yards, because all the evidence before the committee, I believe the Senator will agree, is based upon the estimated cost. The contract price is based upon the estimated cost, but the cost of completing a ship can not be said to be greater at Hog Island than at any of the other yards, because we have not up to this time the data upon which to base that calculation. For instance, they have only delivered three ships at Hog Island. There are 58 under construction, all told; that is to say, 8 or 10 have been launched and new ones are taking the place of those on the ways, and the other ways are occupied by ships in various stages of construction, some of which are nearly 75 per cent completed.

How can it be said we are in a position to tell the cost of constructing these ships? It seems to me it is quite a guess. The estimate at Hog Island was about the same as the estimate on the Pacific coast. I doubt very much, when the facts are all given, if it can be established that the cost of the construction of ships on the Pacific coast is less than it is at Hog Island or on the Atlantic coast. By taking one ship and estimating the total amount of the investment and the fact that only one ship has been turned out you will have one figure, but if you distribute the cost of the yard over the whole number of ships under construction, you will get an entirely different figure and, it seems to me, the only fair figure.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I know that it is impossible at this time to say definitely just what these ships will cost, particularly in the agency yards, but we have had an experience in these yards, where we estimated that the construction of the yards would cost a certain amount, and then we find that in nearly every case the cost of equipping the yards has been 100 per cent more than was estimated. Then, too, Mr. President, I have collected here some tables that I know the distinguished Senator from Florida will examine, and that I have no doubt the Fleet Corporation will examine, and I will venture to place my estimate of the cost of these ships in their completed program against what they may say is the maximum. I have gone out of my way to obtain estimates from men in the shipbuilding line who have given me their best judgment, and I base

my estimate upon my own knowledge of the situation upon the Fleet Corporation reports and other information I have been able to obtain. I feel reasonably certain, when we have the full report after these ships are completed, they will be found to have cost fully as much as I am estimating their cost to be.

A short résumé of the cost-plus contracts with the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation follows:

Num-ber.	Kind.	Dead-weight tons.	Estimated cost.	Estimated cost per dead-weight ton.	Probable cost per dead-weight ton.
40	Tankers.....	382,000	\$88,993,000	\$228	\$270
29	Cargo.....	251,400	49,582,800	197	240
12	Transports.....	150,000	53,713,200	358	430
30	Tugs.....	10,013,000	1,333,766	133	140
111	.....	.....	200,302,000	.....	.....

<sup>1</sup>Each tug.

Mr. VARDAMAN. May I inquire of the Senator if those are the companies owned and controlled by Mr. Schwab?

Mr. CALDER. I am under the impression that Mr. Schwab is interested in the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, although I do not know positively.

There remain the three great "fabricated" yards at Hog Island, Pa.; Bristol, Pa.; and Newark, N. J.

The work in these yards was arranged for under what are known as agency contracts. The Fleet Corporation furnishes all the funds required for the construction of the yards and the building of the ships, placing these funds at the disposal of the contractors, who act as agents of the Fleet Corporation in its expenditure. All expenditures incident to the operation, including salaries of executives and all overhead, are considered a part of the cost and are paid directly from the funds provided by the Fleet Corporation.

The contractors receive a fee of approximately 5 per cent on the estimated cost of the ships, with no fee on the cost of yard construction. This fee may be raised or lowered to the extent of about 25 per cent through the operation of bonus and penalty clauses in the contracts. In the case of the Submarine Boat Corporation, the effect of the change from the agency contract to a lump-sum contract is to give the contractor a price in which is included an estimated profit equal to the maximum profit which could have been earned under the original contract. So that this company, if it makes good on its revised estimates of cost, profits largely by the increased cost of the ships while the American International and Merchants suffer a very considerable loss of profit through the same causes.

The cost of the ships built in these yards, including the cost of yard construction, will be approximately as follows:

	Per dead-weight tons.
Hog Island, transports.....	\$340
Hog Island, cargo ships.....	267
Bristol, cargo ships.....	240
Newark, cargo ships.....	206

The attached tabulations show in detail the results obtained in these three yards and the present rate of progress in construction work.

The salient points brought out by the tables are the following:

Complete failure to deliver ships in time to be of actual use in the war program. Ninety-three were promised, none were delivered.

Failure to the extent of 87 per cent in the number of ships launched. One hundred and sixty-four were promised, 22 were launched.

Failure to the extent of 57 per cent in the number of ships placed in construction. Two hundred and forty-nine were promised, 107 were laid down.

Failure to the extent of 66 per cent in the amount of steel erected and of 74 per cent in the number of rivets driven.

The supply of steel from the mills was nearly up to scheduled requirements and much in excess of the quantity actually used in construction.

The supply of fabricated steel was 35 per cent short of estimated requirements, but exceeded actual erection requirements by many thousands of tons.

The construction progress being made in the month from October 15 to November 15 shows the following:

The number of ships launched and in process of outfitting is 69 per cent below normal for scheduled speed. This fact will seriously limit deliveries of finished ships for some months.

There are a full number of ships under construction on the ways, so that the limiting factor in launching from now on will be labor and its turnout.



The actual construction work, I am informed, is progressing at approximately 40 per cent of scheduled speed.

This means that the yards are a very long way behind in work done to date and that they are losing ground rapidly in comparison with scheduled requirements.

The final completion of the work under contract will probably take nearly a year longer than the time allowed in the contracts.

The effect of spreading the work over this longer period will be to very largely increase the overhead costs through the payment of salaries and incidental expenses for the added time.

There are certain facts which have been made plain to the trained observer as the work has progressed and which must be taken into consideration in judging the results obtained.

(1) The Shipping Board has at no time been made up of men with a knowledge of shipping or shipbuilding problems.

(2) There have been many changes in the personnel of the Shipping Board and consequently in its policies.

(3) A very large part of the time and the energies of the Fleet Corporation has been given over to the building up of a great and cumbersome system of supervision, reports, statistics on every conceivable subject connected with the work. In other words, the emphasis has been put upon the building of an organization and compilation of information which might be useful in a long-extended shipbuilding enterprise rather than upon the building of ships as an emergency measure. Most of this information is practically valueless, as it is taken from an emergency operation being carried on under abnormal circumstances and is not applicable to ordinary conditions.

(4) Another very large part of the efforts of the Fleet Corporation has been devoted to a wide range of social and industrial work—investigations, statistics, welfare work, technical and trade instruction, speech making, and so forth.

(5) In the policy adopted toward labor there has been practically no effort made to enforce ordinary discipline or to indicate to the workmen generally that they were expected to render a fair return of work for the high wages paid. The records indicate that in many instances men being paid by the piece with the possibility of making from \$20 to \$30 a day did three times the quantity of similar work performed by men on a per diem basis. This condition is due in large measure to the apparent disregard for expense, the grossly excessive office and supervisory forces employed, and the knowledge among the workmen of the very high salaries being paid. It is an interesting fact that the Hog Island shipyard's overhead expenses are averaging to-day the sum of \$1,700,000 a month, and since the start of the work in this yard the overhead charges up to December 1 have exceeded \$16,800,000.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Will the Senator pardon me for an inquiry?

Mr. CALDER. Certainly.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Unless I misunderstood the Senator, the overhead charges are paid out of the Public Treasury and not by the private corporation that is conducting the operations.

Mr. CALDER. The Senator is correct. They go as a contribution to the cost of building the ships. The money is taken out of the Public Treasury.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CALDER. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Is Admiral Bowles still in charge at Hog Island?

Mr. CALDER. I believe he is.

Mr. KING. He is the officer who sent an offensive and highly improper telegram to the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER], denouncing a Senator who had called attention to the extravagance and waste at the Hog Island yard.

Mr. CALDER. I do not recall the telegram.

Mr. KING. There was such a telegram. A sheet is published under the authority of those directing operations at Hog Island at a considerable expense to the Government. I saw on the front page of that sheet the telegram to which I referred. It appeared in bold type, and its place in the publication, together with the editorial comment, as I recall, clearly manifested a purpose to attack Senators for daring to criticize Government functionaries and agencies.

I have been waiting to see whether the Secretary of the Navy would call Admiral Bowles to account. If he does not do it, I think that a resolution would be proper asking why action was not taken looking to an explanation of conduct so deserving of censure. No official occupying the position held by Admiral Bowles, or one similar, is warranted in denouncing a member of the legislative branch of the Government as he did. The criticism by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. VARDAMAN] of conditions at Hog Island was made in the discharge of his duty as a Senator and as a member of the committee charged with the responsibility of investigating the work at Hog Island.

If the Senator and the committee found conditions that were improper, or if they believed that there was waste and inexcusable extravagance, it was their duty to challenge attention to the same. It is little less than an outrage that Government funds should be employed to publish libelous screeds, in which officials are denounced as "liars" for their fearless exposure of wrongs and the reckless waste of the taxes of the people.

Mr. CALDER. I would say in response to the Senator from Utah that Admiral Bowles is a retired naval officer, and I doubt whether he is under the control of the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. KING. The attitude of this officer, his lack of appreciation of the proprieties, his violent outbreak, his utilization of a sheet, doubtless under his control, to give this intemperate telegram to the country, indicate that he is not the proper man for the place and that he should be retired therefrom.

Mr. CALDER. Before entering upon a discussion of terms of the contracts for building ships and shipyards, may I for a moment bring the attention of the Senate to some matters included in a report of the Shipping Board recently filed indicating that it has spent upward of \$75,000,000 for housing during the past year? In my judgment, much of this was unnecessary. Many shipyards throughout the country have taken care of the housing of their employees. I believe that this could have been done in other places if the Shipping Board had insisted.

I was interested in the statement made by the senior Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] the other day, in which he called the attention of the Senate to the extraordinary amount of money spent for housing ship workers in northern and eastern States as against the small amount in South Atlantic and Gulf States. I am not here to defend the acts of the Shipping Board in this regard, but to add just a word or two to what the Senator from Florida has stated. He pointed out the amount of money spent in his own State, comparing it to the amount spent in New York.

I remember the figures. They indicated that the amount spent in Florida about equaled the total housing expenditures in New York, despite the fact that in 1918 the State of New York paid into the Federal Treasury over four times as much money as all of the South Atlantic and Gulf States put together.

The thing that interested me most in his statement was the reference to the expenditure of \$1,300,000 at Groton, Conn., for the housing of about 300 men. This would seem to indicate that it cost about \$4,000 to house the ship workers at this point, a sum which all will agree is most extraordinary, and in my judgment inexcusable, unless these houses are built in a location where they could be easily disposed of after the war is over without regard to whether or not the shipyard at Groton remains.

It is impossible to criticize these matters justly without firsthand information, and that is only obtainable where one can visit the place of expenditure or have a personal representative visit it for him.

In this connection I might add that this morning a representative of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, who has charge of housing, appeared before the Committee on Commerce and discussed with the committee some of the expenditures for this purpose. I was quite surprised to find that the average cost of the frame houses of three, four, and five rooms built at Jacksonville, Fla., including land, was over \$4,000. This gentleman stated that in his judgment the Government will be able to sell these houses after the war is over and business is adjusted again at about 60 per cent of their cost to the Government.

I will venture the statement here and take the chance of being a good prophet that in my judgment the Government will be doing very well indeed if we are able to sell these houses for 40 per cent of their cost. If it were left to me to determine the question to-day, and I could sell them for that price, I would make the bargain immediately.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. CALDER. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. During the Senator's absence from the Committee on Commerce this morning another matter came up that I think should be mentioned in this connection. The Government has an agency yard, as the Senator is aware, at Wilmington, N. C.

Mr. CALDER. The Carolina Shipbuilding Corporation.

Mr. LENROOT. Yes; the Carolina Shipbuilding Corporation, at which there are four ways. There was a proposition to construct houses there at an expense of \$500,000. Mr. Piez informed the committee last week that this proposition would be abandoned. A committee from Wilmington, N. C., are here in Washington, and this morning officials of the Shipping Board came before the committee and stated that although not

one dollar of expense has thus far been incurred for the houses, in their opinion we should proceed with the construction of the \$500,000 worth of houses, where it is admitted that the Government will lose 50 per cent of the cost. Unless some committee of Congress shall express itself in opposition to that waste, that money will be wasted, because there is very great pressure being brought to bear to secure that expenditure.

Mr. CALDER. I thank the Senator for calling the Wilmington, N. C., operation to the attention of the Senate. In my judgment it is inexcusable. There ought to be sufficient housing facilities there to take care of the ship workers at the ship plant at Wilmington, and there ought to be people enough interested in this great project in that city to provide housing facilities for the people employed in the shipyards. That has been done at many points all over the country, and there is no reason why it should not be done at this place.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I was not able to be present at the committee meeting this morning, and I should like to ask the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] what showing was made as to the necessity for building houses there now? The winter has been on for some little time and this shipbuilding corporation has been in operation for some time. They certainly have been able to take care of the housing necessities thus far. What was the showing made as to the necessity for this work?

Mr. CALDER. I think perhaps the Senator from Wisconsin can answer that question better than I. He was present at the committee meeting this morning.

Mr. LENROOT. I will state that the yard has just been completed. The first keel was laid last month. My information is that there are 900 men employed there and that it will require a much larger number when they proceed with four ships. Speaking individually, there can be no possible reason for the construction of four ships at a time now at such a very greatly added expense. They have sufficient housing facilities if they will construct two ships at a time.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, in my judgment, certain modifications of the existing conditions should be made at once.

(1) The general policies of the Shipping Board and the scope of its activity should be determined by Congress.

(2) The board should be composed of men whose business experience qualifies them to work out the details under these policies and within the limits set.

(3) The Emergency Fleet Corporation should be organized on a strictly business basis as the construction branch of the Ship-

ping Board. The executive head of the Fleet Corporation should have sufficient authority to enable him to make decisions promptly and to carry on the work as private business is carried on.

(4) The activities of the Fleet Corporation in connection with the work of privately owned yards having contracts for ships should be limited to the proper inspection of the work and to rendering assistance in the supplying of materials and facilities.

(5) The work in the Government-owned yards should be carried on as a direct Government work, under the immediate control and direction of the Fleet Corporation. The assumption that the corporation now acting as agents of the Fleet Corporation under these contracts were really furnishing the "know how" in return for the fees to be paid them is shown to be founded upon a fallacy. They did not "know how" when they began the work; their records show practically no progress toward "knowing how" at present; they have spent and are spending enormous sums of the Government's money unnecessarily; their organizations are unwieldy and extravagant. The cost of the operations would be very much reduced under Government direction.

It would be quite impossible to convert these into lump-sum contracts under existing conditions without paying a price which would be exorbitant in every way. The best results can only be obtained by direct Government operation. Such operation would also make it possible to close out these emergency operations without the complications which must result from working through an agent. The work has gone too far to be canceled to advantage.

Mr. VARDAMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield to me at this point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. CALDER. I yield.

Mr. VARDAMAN. There would be an additional saving if the Government should take over the Hog Island shipyard, for instance, of not less than \$8,000,000 in fees and possibly \$14,000,000 in fees that go to the agent corporation, which has rendered no service at all to the people of the United States.

Mr. CALDER. I thank the Senator from Mississippi.

I have here the total of the requisitioned ships which were contracted for and were under construction at the time of the organization of the Emergency Fleet Corporation that were taken over by them. The summary of these vessels is as follows:

Requisitioned ships.

Kind of ship.	Total contracted for.		Deliveries required to Oct. 31, 1918.		Actual deliveries to Oct. 31, 1918.		Required deliveries not made.		Per cent of failures.
	Ships.	Dead-weight tons.	Ships.	Dead-weight tons.	Ships.	Dead-weight tons.	Ships.	Dead-weight tons.	
Steel cargo.....	318	2,096,652	231	1,356,762	230	1,346,802	1	9,960	.....
Steeltankers.....	62	594,830	29	335,235	35	354,405	6	19,170	6
Steelrefrigerator.....	12	77,700	12	77,700	5	33,200	7	44,500	57
Steeltransports.....	7	34,558	7	34,558	4	18,972	3	15,586	45
Steelcolliers.....	9	70,350	9	70,350	8	61,750	1	8,600	12
Total requisitioned ships.....	408	2,874,090	288	1,874,605	282	1,815,129	6	159,476	3

<sup>1</sup> Surplus.

These vessels, Mr. President, were all contracted for and under construction before we entered the war.

I also submit a table which indicates that the Emergency Fleet Corporation has contracted for the construction of 10,393,000 dead-weight tons of steel vessels, of which only 612,200 tons were delivered up to October 31, 1918.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert this table in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The table referred to is as follows:

Contract steel ships.

Kind of ship.	Total contracted for.		Deliveries required to Oct. 31, 1918.		Actual deliveries to Oct. 31, 1918.		Required deliveries not made.		Per cent of failure.
	Ships.	Dead-weight tons.	Ships.	Dead-weight tons.	Ships.	Dead-weight tons.	Ships.	Dead-weight tons.	
Cargo.....	1,298	8,859,380	225	1,484,748	105	612,200	119	872,548	59
Tanker.....	80	737,000							
Refrigerator.....	4	37,600							
Transport.....	86	704,250							
Hospital.....	2	20,000							
Barges.....	8	34,800	1	7,500			1	7,500	100
Tugs <sup>1</sup> .....	97		3				3		100
	1,573	10,393,030	229	1,492,248	105	612,200	123	880,048	60

<sup>1</sup> Dead-weight tons not given for tugs.



Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—  
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from New York may show it a little later on; but I wonder whether he does show just what time these ten-million-odd tons are to be completed under the contract?

Mr. CALDER. I have not those figures, Mr. President. I have the figures here indicating the total tonnage that should have been delivered on the day of the signing of the armistice; and those figures are 1,492,248 tons, of which only 612,200 tons were delivered. I have not, however, the facts asked for by the Senator from Washington.

It is an interesting fact that of 106 steel ships delivered up to October 31, 43 of these were constructed on the Pacific coast, 60 on the Great Lakes, and 3 on the North Atlantic seaboard. The question undoubtedly will be asked why were more not delivered from the Atlantic coast yards. This can be answered by the statement that these yards were all filled by orders for naval ships and merchant vessels requisitioned by the Shipping Board.

I ask unanimous consent to print in connection with my remarks a table showing the cost and progress of the ships being constructed by the American International Shipbuilding Corporation at Hog Island, Pa. This statement shows that the yard construction exceeds by \$34,000,000, or 113 per cent of the original estimates, and that the ship construction will probably exceed the estimates by the sum of \$81,000,000, or 32 per cent of the total. These figures indicate a careful analysis of the whole project. Under the schedule agreed upon 15 ships should have been delivered by November 11. None were delivered by that date.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, permission to print the table referred to will be granted.

The table referred to is as follows:

*Statement of cost and progress.*

	Estimated cost.	Probable cost.	Excess cost.	Per cent excess.
Yard construction.....	\$30,000,000	\$64,000,000	\$34,000,000	113
Ship construction.....	256,000,000	337,000,000	81,000,000	32
Contractor's fee.....	11,825,000	9,061,000	2,764,000	23
Total.....	307,825,000	410,061,000	112,236,000	36

<sup>1</sup> Reduction.

*Production.*

Cumulative results.	Required to Nov. 11, 1918.	Actual to Nov. 11, 1918.	Shortage.	Per cent of shortage.
Ships delivered.....	15	.....	15	100
Ships launched.....	46	4	42	91
Ships placed in construction.....	91	49	42	46
Steel laid on ways..... tons..	198,000	80,000	118,000	60
Rivets driven.....	32,000,000	9,300,000	22,700,000	71
Steel fabricated..... tons..	340,000	230,000	110,000	32
Steel rolled..... do.....	510,000	427,000	83,000	16

Current work.	Required.	Actual.	Shortage.	Per cent of shortage.
Ships in outfitting basin.....	31	4	27	89
Ships on ways.....	45	45	.....	.....
Steel on ways..... tons..	70,000	68,800	1,200	.....
Rivets in ships on ways.....	9,000,000	7,200,000	1,800,000	20
Steel laid last month..... tons..	50,000	15,300	34,700	69
Rivets driven last month.....	9,000,000	3,196,000	5,804,000	64

Mr. CALDER. The first ship launched was scheduled for delivery 51 days after launching. On November 11, 98 days after launching, she was still undelivered.

I ask also unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a statement of the cost and progress of the Merchants Shipbuilding Corporation, at Bristol, Pa. These figures indicate that the cost of the yard construction exceeded the estimates by the sum of \$6,500,000 and that the probable cost of the ship construction will exceed the estimates by over \$31,000,000.

Under the schedule agreed upon 25 ships should have been delivered by November 11. Not one was delivered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the table referred to by the Senator from New York will be printed in the RECORD.

The table referred to is as follows:

*Statement of cost and progress.*

	Estimated cost.	Probable cost.	Excess cost.	Per cent excess.
Yard construction.....	\$7,450,000	\$14,000,000	\$6,550,000	88
Ship construction.....	78,324,480	109,654,000	31,329,520	40
Contractor's fee.....	3,840,000	3,000,000	1,840,000	22
Total.....	89,614,480	126,654,000	37,039,520	41

<sup>1</sup> Reduction.

*Production.*

Cumulative results.	Required to Nov. 11, 1918.	Actual to Nov. 11, 1918.	Shortage.	Per cent of shortage.
Ships delivered.....	25	.....	25	100
Ships launched.....	29	3	26	90
Ships placed in construction.....	41	15	26	63
Steel laid on ways..... tons..	102,000	30,000	72,000	70
Rivets driven.....	18,500,000	3,900,000	14,600,000	79
Steel fabricated..... tons..	125,400	65,400	60,000	48
Steel rolled..... do.....	155,000	113,000	42,000	27

Current work.	Required.	Actual.	Shortage.	Per cent of shortage.
Ships on outfitting basin.....	4	3	1	25
Ships on ways.....	12	12	.....	.....
Steel on ways..... tons..	17,550	21,000	3,450	120
Rivets in ships on ways.....	2,640,000	2,250,000	390,000	15
Steel laid last month..... tons..	10,000	4,800	5,200	52
Rivets driven last month.....	1,743,000	900,000	843,000	48

<sup>1</sup> Surplus.

Mr. CALDER. The first ship launched was scheduled for delivery 28 days after launching. On November 11, 89 days after launching, she was still undelivered.

Mr. President, in my judgment it will be found that the change in the contract between the Emergency Fleet Corporation and the Submarine Boat Corporation from cost plus with fixed profit modified to a lump-sum price will be profitable to the Government. It is true that the ships being constructed by this concern will cost \$27,000,000 more than at first estimated, but most of this increase can be accounted for by the increased cost of labor and material, and while the Submarine Boat Corporation will apparently earn \$2,000,000 more than the profit originally fixed in the contract, in the end this will be advantageous to the Government, for here the contract is really an incentive for the builder to finish his work expeditiously and economically.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a table with total figures on the progress and cost of the work of the Submarine Boat Corporation.

Under the schedule agreed upon, 53 ships should have been delivered by November 11, and not one was delivered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the absence of objection, the table referred to by the Senator from New York will be printed in the RECORD.

The table referred to is as follows:

*Statement of cost and progress.*

	Estimated cost.	Probable cost.	Excess cost.	Per cent excess.
Yard construction.....	\$8,500,000	\$17,000,000	\$8,500,000	100
Ship construction.....	109,500,000	136,500,000	27,000,000	25
Contractor's fee.....	5,475,000	7,500,000	2,025,000	37
Total.....	123,475,000	161,000,000	37,525,000	30

<sup>1</sup> Profit estimated.

*Production.*

Cumulative results.	Required to Nov. 11, 1918.	Actual to Nov. 11, 1918.	Shortage.	Per cent of shortage.
Ships delivered.....	53	.....	53	100
Ships launched.....	89	15	74	83
Ships placed in construction.....	117	43	74	63
Steel laid on ways..... tons..	182,000	55,000	127,000	70
Rivets driven.....	31,000,000	8,060,000	22,940,000	74
Steel fabricated..... tons..	193,000	133,000	60,000	31
Steel rolled..... do.....	240,000	126,000	114,000	19

<sup>1</sup> Surplus.

## Production—Continued.

Current work.	Required.	Actual.	Shortage.	Per cent of shortage.
Ships in outfitting basin.....	36	15	21	58
Ships on ways.....	28	28		
Steel on ways..... tons.....	25,000	26,500	1,500	6
Rivets in ships on ways.....	3,472,000	3,610,000	138,000	4
Steel laid last month..... tons.....	17,700	9,000	8,700	49
Rivets driven last month.....	3,100,000	1,650,000	1,450,000	47

<sup>1</sup> Surplus.

Mr. CALDER. The average time on the ways for the 15 ships launched previous to November 11 was 191 days.

The first ship launched was scheduled for delivery in four months from date of launching. On November 11 she had been in the water nearly six months and was still undelivered. Three others were in the water nearly four months and still undelivered.

In considering time consumed on these ships, it must be considered that they are only about 65 per cent as large as those in the other two yards and are simpler in many ways.

The figures I have quoted indicate that, including the requisitioned contract steel ships and wooden cargo ships, when completed, the United States will have a net tonnage of 16,000,000 tons. This is, of course, exclusive of privately owned American ships, which will total about 4,000,000 dead-weight tons.

If this fleet of vessels are of a character that can compete with the tonnage of England and other maritime nations of the world, then, indeed, the United States has made a real advance toward a permanently successful merchant marine.

Recently in the hearings before the Committee on Commerce Mr. Piez, general manager of the Emergency Fleet Corporation, stated in reply to a query that the Fleet Corporation was carefully examining into the question as to whether or not the ships being built by them were competent to compete with the ships being constructed in England and Japan and other maritime countries. This is a very important matter, for if this great tonnage, when completed, is not of a character to carry freight as expeditiously as other nations, then, indeed, our ships will have been built in vain.

This question is one that has been occupying the attention of the maritime powers of the world for the past year. They knew that we were building a great fleet of fabricated vessels that could be operated at a speed of 10 knots an hour, and I am told that Great Britain a year ago began the construction of ships that would outsail ours. The Shipping Board denies that this is so and insists that our vessels can compete with the rest of the world. I sincerely hope that this is true.

Newspapers indicate that the Shipping Board have purchased the International Mercantile Marine. I do not know whether or not this is so, but with the war over I can not understand the necessity of this purchase. Many of the ships owned by this company are splendid vessels. Others are old and antiquated, some of them having been in commission for over 30 years. Newspapers suggest that these vessels were purchased by the Shipping Board only because an English company was about to take them over. The war is over, and I can not see any reason why we should pay an exorbitant price for these ships simply because some one else wants them. Surely in the course of a year or two, when business is normal again, we could duplicate this fleet for less money than the Government is paying for it. If we did that we could build modern vessels which could compete in speed and in equipment with any other fleet afloat.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I ask the Senator, just on that point, not committing myself one way or the other, or going into any details regarding that transaction, if he would not think that \$90 a ton in cash for those ships would be getting them at very much less than we could build them for, and be a very fine bargain?

Mr. CALDER. In answer to the Senator from Florida, I will say that there are many ships owned by the International Mercantile Marine that would be cheap at \$90 a ton—very cheap—and a great many of them would be very dear at that figure.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am speaking now of the whole tonnage, of about 850,000 tons. The fleet includes such ships, as the Senator knows, as the *Olympic*, the *Adriatic*, the *Celtic*, and other ships which originally cost over \$200 a ton. Taking the whole tonnage of 850,000 tons at \$90 a ton, would not the Senator think that was a bargain?

Mr. CALDER. That would seem to be a bargain, I will admit, at present prices and under present conditions, but I am convinced that before two years roll by we can in this country duplicate that fleet for very nearly the price we are asked for it by the International Mercantile Marine. For my part, as between purchasing them at that figure and not purchasing them at all under present conditions, with the tremendous tonnage that we now have in sight, I should prefer not to purchase them.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Will the Senator from New York tell me under what flag those ships are now operating?

Mr. CALDER. I understand that most of them are now operating under the flag of Great Britain.

We will have when our present shipbuilding program is completed a large number of cargo ships with speed ranging from 10 to 14 knots, but so far as I have been informed we will have no greater passenger ships, and the money spent by the Shipping Board for the purchase of the International Mercantile Marine might better be utilized for this purpose.

As I indicated in the opening of my remarks, the law provides that the authority granted to the President in relation to the construction and operation of these vessels shall cease six months after the final treaty of peace is proclaimed between this Government and the German Empire. This presents a problem to the Congress which warrants their beginning at once an intimate study of our whole maritime problem.

What disposition shall we make of this fleet of vessels that cost this country nearly \$4,000,000,000? Will it be the determination of Congress to permit the Shipping Board to operate these vessels permanently? Shall we lay down a governmental policy by which ultimately we shall drive out of business every privately owned vessel in America, or shall we offer for sale this fleet to men accustomed to the operation of ships at a reasonable price, marking off their cost the additional war-time expenditures, and then, after that is done, can we operate them successfully in competition with our maritime rivals?

Robert Dollar has suggested the sale of this entire fleet at a reasonable figure and its operation under the American flag, paying to the seamen employed on the vessels the difference in pay between that given by foreign shipowners and the amount usually paid to American seamen? We are informed by the newspapers that Mr. Hurley, the president of the Shipping Board, is in Europe seeking to make arrangements with our maritime competitors by which they will increase the compensation of the men who sail on their ships to the same rate we give ours. A moment's consideration of this statement will stamp the suggestion as absurd. Does anyone suppose that Japan, Norway, Italy, or Spain, without considering Great Britain, France, or Germany, will ever agree to any such proposal?

Shall we, as has been suggested, organize a corporation under Federal charter, the stock of which shall be purchased by individuals, and to which the Government shall guarantee a reasonable return, this fleet to be turned over to this corporation at a fair price and then conducted by it as a private enterprise?

To any student of American shipping it must be apparent that no American fleet of merchant vessels can be operated without Government aid either in one form or another. If it is operated as a Government enterprise the loss will be covered up in appropriations by Congress for the maintenance of the fleet. This sort of business everyone knows will be extravagant and inefficient and can not hope to be permanent, and, so far as I am concerned, it is my purpose to oppose permanent control and operation of a Government-owned merchant marine.

The seaman's act, too, must be modified. I have offered amendments to it which I am hopeful after a thorough examination of the subject may meet with the favorable consideration of Congress. I believe these amendments will not injure the men who sail the seas and will be most helpful to the owners. We lacked sufficient seamen to operate the vessels sailing under our own flag before the war began.

We have brought a great many men into the service, but those who have examined this subject know that most of the men recruited into the merchant marine during the war will go back to their former vocations. With a fleet five times as large as we had in 1916, we can not hope to operate it under the present regulations. I would not for a moment take away from these men the additional safeguards and comforts given them by this measure, but a modification would be welcomed by those who have examined into the subject fully. Never since the Civil War has such an opportunity presented itself to this country to have



a merchant marine as it does to-day. We are building one at enormous expenditure—three times what it would have cost in peace days—but somehow or other we could not agree upon the terms of building one in less perilous times. It has seemed to those who live on the seaboard that the people back in the country have failed to understand that if we hope to maintain a permanent foreign market for the products of the factory and the farm we must maintain a merchant marine under the American flag to carry our American goods to the places where they could be sold advantageously.

To-day that fleet is in sight. Shall we dissipate it by lack of foresight? Shall we not begin by telling the American people the truth, explain to them that we can not hope to succeed unless they are willing to contribute each year some little part toward the maintenance of this fleet, or shall we pretend that American ingenuity can outstrip England, Japan, and other maritime competitors?

We need to look back to the history of other days to realize the part the American Nation played in trade on the seas; how in the years following the Revolution American vessels carried 92 per cent of our overseas trade, and this was built up through preferential customs duties and tonnage taxes. We saw this business dwindle until in the spring of 1914 only 8 per cent of our foreign trade was carried in ships flying the American flag. Will we permit this condition to exist again? We brag of our greatness and our capacity to supply the world, and yet in the days before we entered the European war south of Panama a Bank of England note was worth more than our gold. We insist that we were the first country to open the door to China—and we did—but China has not seen us since. Nor does she know why the American flag never flies in her ports. We were the first Nation to open the door to Japan, and if we cross the ocean and enter her island empire we must do so under her own flag. The Philippines are ours, but Japan controls the trade of the islands. Hawaii is a Province of this country, but her great trade is with the Orient. Porto Rico is under the dominion of the United States, but much of her trade is still with Spain. South America is nearer to us than she is to Europe, and by every rule of business ought to be our customer; but England and Germany have dominated her commerce for half a century. Our Monroe doctrine has protected Mexico, but she laughs at our protestations of friendliness.

American ingenuity first thought out water transportation by steam, and we are now for the first time in 50 years actually considering the creation of a permanent merchant marine. American shipbuilders conceived the iron ship, and until the surrender of the German fleet we were fourth in the navies of the world, and before the outbreak of the European war our overseas merchant marine was less than that of Norway, although we have forty times her population and three hundred times her wealth.

In our War with Spain the United States was compelled to rake the shipping of the world to get sufficient transports and colliers to carry an army to Cuba and the Philippines and to supply auxiliary craft for the Navy. In 1907, when our fleet sailed around the world, we did not have enough American colliers to furnish coal for our ships of war. In the present war we were compelled to move an army from our shores to France, and if it had not been for the transports furnished by England and France instead of having 2,200,000 men in Europe on November 1 and to have supplied them with the things that an army needs we would not have had one-third of that number there.

The first 1,000,000 tons of steel ships delivered by American shipbuilders to our Shipping Board since the war began would not have been obtained but for the foresight of English and Norwegian companies, who had contracted with American shipbuilders for them, and these ships were requisitioned by our own Government. We must have the best of ships so that we may compete under the best circumstances. I have already referred to the fact that the creation of this great merchant fleet now under construction would cost when completed upward of \$4,000,000,000, and of that sum at least \$1,500,000,000 is still to be spent. Will the American people stand for this additional outlay? I am hopeful that they will.

Let us modify the law so that these vessels may be sold to private interests and operated by them for the benefit of the American people. I am sure a method can be evolved that will save the country the least possible loss and assure the effective utilization of this great national investment. I am mindful of the fact in considering this whole problem that we must contend with two great competitors.

First, England, with her capacity for the sea, her great shipyards, and her ability to build and operate vessels much cheaper than we can, with her colonies and island possessions all over the face of the earth, enabling her to trade to and from these

places profitably, while ships with American cargoes sailing from American ports for other countries will often have difficulty in obtaining return business. England has built up through her banking and other trade facilities business connections in the remotest corners of the world. To compete successfully with her we must establish trade relations and be prepared to extend the same credits as any other nation. We must know the methods of the rest of the world and be prepared to meet them with an American system and American goods better than theirs, or else our merchant marine will be of little value, for without trade to carry our ships are useless.

Second. Our second serious competitor is Japan, that wonderful country, that has already driven our merchant marine from the Pacific Ocean and can at much less cost build and man a merchant marine. We can not hope to regain our former position in the trade with the Orient unless the Government is willing to assist.

These are serious questions which require the careful consideration of the wisest men of the Nation. I have wondered if our present Shipping Board, which is apparently committed to a policy of Government ownership, has had the sort of experience that equips them to handle a problem of this magnitude. I regret that the President has not seen fit to place upon the board men of wide experience in the building and operating of ships.

This is the first genuine opportunity the United States has had for a real merchant marine in the past 60 years, and if we had the courage to go to the American people, explain to them that we have invested nearly \$4,000,000,000 of their money in this undertaking, and that to maintain it we must have their support—if we do this in an intelligent way without partisan bias I am sure they will respond.

#### PRICE OF WHEAT.

Mr. GRONNA and Mr. FLETCHER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I listened this afternoon to the very interesting debate with reference to the situation in Russia. It is too late to now enter into any further discussion of that matter. I simply wish to say that I agree with the statements made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] that we can hardly expect to restore peace in that great domain by sending armies there. I believe we can accomplish more by feeding that hungry nation. We know that in the case of an individual when he is hungry he is dangerous, and it is even more true that a starving nation is dangerous. For that reason, Mr. President, I am going to take the time of the Senate for a few moments to address myself to the question of production and the question of the prices of foodstuffs.

A great many communications with reference to the price of wheat for 1919 are addressed to me, and every day I am receiving letters asking for information relative to the guaranty by the Government for the 1919 crop.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. GRONNA. I am sorry, Mr. President, that I can not yield to the Senator. I shall finish my remarks in the course of 10 or 15 minutes.

On the 4th day of December last there was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter written by Judge Glasgow, chief counsel for the Food Administration, which letter was addressed to me. This letter fully explains the act fixing the price of wheat for 1918, and also the power extended to the President of the United States to guarantee the price for 1919. It also shows very clearly that the administration intends to fulfill the promises made by Congress and by the administration to the wheat growers of the country, and will ask that the law shall be enforced.

I regret to say, however, that I have observed statements credited to some of the officers of the Food Administration, and also to the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture of the House, giving an estimate of the losses which the Government is about to sustain because of this guaranty. I fear that such statements will have their damaging effects upon the production of wheat for 1919.

It has frequently been stated that agriculture is the real foundation of all our industrial wealth. If that be true, everything possible should be done to encourage this industry.

We are just emerging from a world's war, and we have learned from experience that wheat is an indispensable article of food, especially so in times of war, because of its keeping qualities; but it is also an indispensable article of food in times of peace, as it is the most nutritious, wholesome, and by far the cheapest and best cereal in the production of bread.



Those of you who are representing States where manufacturing is the leading industry and where labor is necessarily largely employed are naturally concerned about the protection of these manufactures, as well as in the welfare of the factory workers; but have you carefully considered the fact that without this article of food—bread—your men would have to stop work and your factories would cease operation?

You have had an opportunity recently to try substitutes for wheat bread, and I know that you do not like them.

Now, I ask you to continue to help not only the American farmer who produces wheat, but the laboring man, the people of the United States as a whole, in securing the most nutritious, wholesome food article, and at a lower price—yes, not even one-half the cost of other articles of food on the world's market to-day.

For fear that you have forgotten our admonitions and advice, I am going to ask you to listen to me for just a moment—long enough to tell you what it is costing the American people for bread.

The present price of wheat will average in the various markets in the United States a little less than \$2.25 per bushel. Four and a half bushels of wheat will make one barrel of flour. Most people believe that the average consumption of flour per capita is one barrel for the entire year. The Agricultural Department estimates that 5.3 bushels are consumed by one individual person a year. At \$2.25 per bushel, using the estimate of the Agricultural Department that it takes 5.3 bushels to feed a human being for an entire year, the cost would be \$11.93 at the mill. This would make a little more than a barrel of flour.

Now, I want to be perfectly fair, and will allow \$1.07, or at the rate of \$1 per barrel, for marketing and the profit to the retailer, which would make the cost of flour to the consumer \$13 per barrel, or a little less than 3.6 cents per day, providing you make your own bread; and let me say right now that on the 7,000,000 farms in the United States every ounce of bread is made by the housewife. The housewife on the farm is not depending on somebody else to manufacture the bread for the farm, and I think I might say with perfect safety that nowhere on the face of the earth will you find as nutritious and as wholesome, good bread as may be found on the farm. If the people of the cities refuse to use economy and manufacture their own bread, that should not be laid at the door of the American farmer. Perhaps your bread is costing you more than it ought to cost you, but if it does, it is your fault and not the farmers' fault.

Anyone who has taken the time to study the production of wheat for the entire world knows that there is to-day no great surplus. If we take all the countries into consideration, there is no surplus. The average world production of wheat from 1909 to 1916, inclusive, was about 3,700,000,000 bushels. The estimated population of the world is approximately 1,650,000,000. It may be said that we have different races, and some of the human race do not eat wheat, but we do know that the white, or Caucasian race, the black race, and the red race, all use wheat for bread. It is perhaps true that the yellow, or Mongolic, race, does not use as much wheat as the other races, but the yellow races constitute about 581,000,000, and they use some wheat. But, at any rate, it leaves more than 1,000,000,000 people whose chief article of food is bread. So that with a production of 3,700,000,000 bushels of wheat and a population of more than 1,000,000,000, which for centuries have used wheat as the chief cereal for bread, it is evident that if wheat is distributed to all these people who desire this article for food, there is a large shortage, and not a surplus. Of course, it may be said, and I take it that to a certain extent it is true, that not all of these people are able to purchase wheat. They use other cereals for bread.

I have a statement issued by the Agricultural Department on January 7, 1919, which shows that the visible supply in the United States on December 1, 1918, was only 175,000,000 bushels, and in Argentina less than 2,000,000 bushels. Of course, by including the harvests of 1918 and 1919, it is estimated that Argentina may have a surplus of 185,000,000 bushels, but that is entirely problematical—it is only a guess—nobody knows what the crop is really going to be. The department estimates that Australia has 170,000,000 bushels, and by including the harvests for 1918 and 1919, it estimates that there may be a surplus of 210,000,000 bushels; but we are not certain about that.

Now, outside of Canada and British India, no other countries can be expected to raise a surplus. The war-stricken countries of Europe, with their soils devastated, their labor disorganized, will not be able to produce enough to feed themselves, and they must depend upon America and upon the countries which I have named for the necessary food products.

Those who complain about the fixed price of wheat should know that the best information obtainable shows that the average cost of producing a bushel of wheat, based upon the labor cost of 1917, is \$2.47. The average maximum price at the terminals, which does not mean that price to the farmer, is \$2.25. Now, if it cost the farmer \$2.47 to produce a bushel of wheat in 1917, what did it cost him in 1918, when wages were much higher? And I dare say they will be higher in 1919 than they were in 1917. Why all this cry about the loss to the Government of the United States in guaranteeing a price at least 22 cents less per bushel than it cost to produce it? Where is the injustice to the American consumer? Do not you know that it costs the American farmer more to produce wheat now than it did before the war? Do not you know that the articles which he must buy and the labor which he must hire are costing more?

I have before me a pamphlet issued by the American Exchange National Bank, of New York City, under date of January 1, 1919. I want to read from this pamphlet a short paragraph:

Buying on a gold basis, inflation of the currency amply secured by gold and other legal resources does not depreciate paper money as measured in gold; but the money of the country, including gold coinage, may be depreciated when measured in commodities. The value of a bushel of wheat as food never varies, but a bushel of wheat commands more dollars and cents just now than it did before the war. The outstanding circulation of the United States is about \$54 a head, or about \$20 above the average of prewar days. The average price of commodities is now about 290 per cent, or almost three times the average price before the war.

Now, these are matters to think about. The average price of commodities is now about 290 per cent, or almost three times the average price before the war.

The farmer is necessarily a much heavier purchaser than the common laborer; he must buy his mechanical tools and machinery and all things necessary to carry on his farming operations besides what the laborer who works in the factory necessarily must buy. In other words, besides food and clothing, the farmer must buy all articles necessary to carry on his business, and it often happens that the farmer is compelled to buy more machinery during a single year than the value of his entire crop for that year.

I said a moment ago that we have testimony from the most reliable sources that it cost to produce wheat in 1917 \$2.47 a bushel. Dr. Spillman, one of the ablest men in the service of the Department of Agriculture, has made a statement that in accordance with his estimates, based upon reports for a number of years, wheat cost to produce not less than \$2.47.

We ought to remember that most people now believe that the war is over. During the war the farmers felt that it was their patriotic duty to plant wheat and other grains, regardless of whether they made or lost money. It is different now. Believing that the war is ended the farmers feel that they are not now under the obligation of planting and producing a crop which will sustain a loss, and it is my judgment that we should not discourage the production of wheat, because the farmer may turn his energies to the production of other commodities. More than that, it may, as has been so often the case, discourage him from engaging in the industry altogether.

We hear so much about the "back to the farm" movement, and we are asked why is it that the farm boys are leaving the farms and going to the cities to engage in other industries and in other work? The answer is plain. It is because the farm boy and the farm girl can make more money in the cities. They can get more wages and work less hours, and it is human nature to want to make as much, and with as little expended energy, as possible.

I am writing this letter in the RECORD in the hopes that it may help to counteract the statements which have been made and circulated through the press that the Government may lose hundreds of millions of dollars because the President and Congress have indicated a willingness to enforce the contract made with the individual producers of wheat in this country. I do not believe that the farmers should be compelled to continue to sell their products at a loss, and I have shown that the average cost of wheat to the farmer is more than the price fixed by the Government.

There will be no loss to the Government, unless some genius should undertake and succeed in perfecting an organization which would control the world's market and use such organization to depress prices.

Let us remember that before we entered this war wheat sold in the American markets for a dollar a bushel more than the price we fixed. But when the legislation which was finally enacted was pending we were told by Mr. Hoover that the reason for fixing the price of wheat was to stabilize prices in order to assure production. He stated and restated the proposition that



he was opposed to a maximum price and that he wanted only a minimum price fixed. Everybody knows that the minimum price was made the maximum price. The price of wheat was controlled absolutely by the organization known as the Grain Corporation, and for two years we controlled the price of the farmers' most valuable crop at a price per bushel of at least \$1 less than what it would have brought in the market if it had been left to the laws of supply and demand.

Do you mean to tell me that, now that the war is over, you are going to repudiate the contract which in times of war took from the pockets of the farmer one-third of what he would have received for his crop if he had been left alone, and that, now you believe there is going to be a surplus, you are going to begin to further discourage him by refusing to fulfill a contract made by Congress and approved by the President of the United States? But you say the farmers have made money out of their crops during the war. In some localities they have; in others they have not made any money; and the most money has been made by the farmer who has been fortunate enough to have most of his own help. If any one of you have visited the farms in this country during the war, you must have seen that old men and women who had retired, and who really felt that they were unable to perform any hard labor, were found in the fields from early morning until late at night, assisting as best they could in the production of food. You must have seen young boys and girls struggling from sunrise until dark, bending all their energies, doing everything possible to perform a man's work. Labor was not only high in price but was scarce and inefficient.

To those of you who believe that the farmer is making large profits let me say to you that the West stands with open arms to receive you and to encourage you to engage in that industry. We are not asking for any exclusive rights to engage in this industry at all. We say to the people of the world: We are glad to have you within the borders of our State; we are glad to have you with us and to compete with us in this great industry. We will not discourage you, but help you if we can. At least we will be neighborly and friendly.

The unfortunate situation, so far as the farmer is concerned, has always been that his organization has never been completed. It has generally been ruined by some ambitious genius who, through his own selfishness, has succeeded in keeping from the farmer the facts, and in that way misled him, and instead of perfecting the organization so necessary to his success, both in production and in marketing his products, it has generally gone on the rocks and been made a regrettable failure.

It must be apparent to every citizen that a man who begins his labors at early dawn and works all day until night, and very often part of the night, that he is not in a position to keep posted on affairs. It is for that reason that the farmer has been unable to perfect his organizations, and it is because he has been imposed upon by unscrupulous men who have posed as his friends but in reality have been his worst enemies. These are the reasons why the farmer has not succeeded. The labor organizations of this country are now demanding that those who go out on the farms to work shall insist on an eight-hour day. You know what that would mean to the consumers. Let us suppose that all the farmers in the United States resolved to work only eight hours a day. What do you suppose wheat would cost you per bushel if they should insist on making a profit in their business?

These are matters which must be solved in the near future. There is as much necessity for reconstruction and readjustment in the great industry of agriculture as there is in the enterprise of any other industry, and all the farmers ask is that the same standard of justice shall be applied to them and their industry that is applied to labor and to those who are engaged in the business of manufacture.

It is remarkable, and I might say regrettable, to note how apt we are to forget the importance of agriculture, and when questions of which we may be somewhat ignorant are presented we are not only indifferent but we see ghosts, because we do not understand or realize the importance of the matters.

I have often been met with the suggestion that agriculture is as old as the world, and while that may be true I doubt if the United States and the allies could have been successful in the recent war if the old method of farming had not been improved upon. If our people had not emerged from the old system of using a crooked stick for a plow, I am fearful that we would have been in the same condition that Jacob and the Israelites were some 17 centuries before the birth of Christ, when the people of Israel had to go to Egypt for their corn. We would have been in a great deal worse situation than the Israelites were, because there would have been no place for us to go to to secure food products.

If we want peace restored in the world we must first provide the people with food. A hungry man is a dangerous man, and we can hardly expect that the starving people of the world are in a position or in a frame of mind to help restore the peace of the world so that it will be safe for democracy.

Mr. President, I ask to have printed at the conclusion of my remarks a statement prepared by the Department of Agriculture.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES of New Mexico in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

*Wheat—Production, visible supply, and surplus.*

Country.	Production, 1918.	Visible supply Dec. 1, 1918.	Estimated surplus.
	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>	<i>Bushels.</i>
United States.....	517,100,000	175,000,000	
Argentina.....	219,431,000	1,850,000	185,000,000
Chile.....	28,292,000		
Uruguay.....	12,800,000		
Italy.....	176,308,000		
Spain.....	127,981,000		
Switzerland.....	7,095,000		
British India <sup>2</sup> .....	379,829,000		75,000,000
Japan.....	31,127,000		
Egypt.....	32,555,000		
Tunis.....	8,451,000		
Union of South Africa.....	8,833,000		
Australia.....	121,772,000	170,000,000	210,000,000
New Zealand.....	6,274,000		
United Kingdom.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	17,500,000	
Canada.....	( <sup>3</sup> )	55,388,000	100,000,000
Afloat.....		19,248,000	
Total.....	2,077,971,000	439,052,000	570,000,000

<sup>1</sup> Including harvests of 1918-19.

<sup>2</sup> Includes native States.

<sup>3</sup> No data.

Mr. GRONNA. I also ask to have printed an article which will be found in the Nation's Business, written by Mr. Howard Heinz. I desire the entire article to be printed in connection with my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From The Nation's Business, January, 1919.]

A HEART-TO-HEART ABOUT THE FARMER—"BACK TO THE LAND"—CERTAINLY! BUT WHAT ARE WE DOING FOR THIS "LAND"?

(By Howard Heinz, vice president H. G. Heinz Co.)

America has always had vastly greater natural resources than it has had capital or organization to use. Stimulated by war's necessities and assisted by governmental support, our mining and manufacturing industries have been reequipped and reorganized up to a plane that has more closely approximated these resources; and while this has also been measurably true of our agricultural industry, agriculture, during the war period, has made less advance proportionate to the increased demand upon it. And with half the world facing starvation through the devastation of its soil and the division of its man power into non-productive channels, the problem of world food production during the reconstruction period becomes one of the first magnitude.

Perhaps the principal reason for the failure of our agricultural progress to keep pace with the growth of the Nation, even in normal times, has been a lack of understanding on the part of our urban population of the farmer's problem and a consequent lack of cooperation and encouragement, but this condition has doubtless been improved by the economic lessons which the war has taught us. The farmer and his usefulness to the community is perhaps held in higher appreciation to-day than at any time before in the entire period of our marvelous industrial development, but there remains much to be accomplished before we can reach anything approaching an ideal condition.

For the most part wholly unorganized in any practical way that looks to cooperative productive effort, and to improvement in marketing and distribution methods, a constant prey to the whims of changing weather conditions and compelled to battle unceasingly against the ravages of innumerable pests, it is safe to say that the financial return to the average American farmer is less than that received by the lowest-paid mechanic in any established trade.

With conditions such as described, how can the farmer compete in the labor market for his necessary help, especially when it is remembered that in place of eight hours and time and a half for overtime the farmer's daily work begins with the rising sun and is more often than otherwise finished by the light of the moon. How can he raise the necessary capital out of his meager returns for drainage, fertilizing, and other means of soil improvement? How can he avail himself of costly mechanical tools in substitution for the needed man power which is equally beyond his reach?

The wholesale desertion of eastern farms in recent years, the change from proprietary to tenant farming that is constantly taking place in all sections, the emigration of the bred-in-the-bone western farmer to Canadian land to secure the easier primitive conditions there prevailing, and the flocking of the young people from farms to cities to engage in commercial pursuits all tell an eloquent story of the lack of appreciation and suitable recognition hitherto given to the tiller of the soil.

OVERWORKED AND UNDERPAID.

Every laborer is worthy of his hire, and as labor that is underpaid and especially that which is both overworked and underpaid will seek new channels of effort, it is to be devoutly hoped that war's lessons concerning the importance to our general welfare, and even to our permanent safety, of a thriving and prosperous farming community may not go unheeded.

That the farmer is in some degree to blame for his present condition may not be denied, but far more blameworthy are those interests which have failed to lead, encourage, and support him or which have exploited him.

Successful agriculture constitutes the very foundation of a nation's prosperity. If we are to continue to have available that food surplus for export that is needed to help maintain our balance of world trade, if we are even to continue to be a self-supporting nation in the matter of food supply, there must be a more effective support given to our farming interests; financial, educational, moral, social.

#### MORE ADVANTAGES FOR THE FARMER.

There must be leadership where we naturally look for leadership in our other lines of activity; intelligent leadership by our men of affairs that will point the way and provide the means to better practical education in improved farm methods, better and more practical local organization of farm interests that will result in more co-operative buying and that will gain for the farmer the advantage of collective bargaining for the sale of what he produces.

The more economical purchase and more intelligent use of fertilizers; seed selection on a large scale; the proper adaptation of soil; rotation of crops as well to meet prospective market conditions as in the interest of soil improvement; the cooperative purchase and cooperative use of farm tractors and other devices calculated to increase production and lighten labor; increase and improvement in stock breeding; a degree of efficiency in scientific management that while increasing product will decrease costs; and an adequate financial backing should be some of the beneficial outgrowths of proper organization in our farm communities that may be depended upon to put our farm operations on a reasonably remunerative basis and encourage the "back to the land" movement advocated by our theoretical economists and with so negligible a result.

Much is being done for the uplift of the farming industry by our Government departments and educational institutions. Our Federal and State departments of agriculture, with their local agents in practically every country, have developed a marvelous efficiency in recent years and the results of their labors are manifest on every hand. Our agricultural colleges have gone far in the dissemination of practical farm knowledge, but the influence of these institutions is not far enough reaching; the process is too slow to meet the urgent need of the day; the work they do must be augmented and extended by the public-spirited men of every community before it will become really effective in influencing general results in any larger way.

With no possible prospect of restoring normal crop conditions in Europe under two or three years or of reconstituting its animal industry in a decade, there is an assured market for all that we can produce in cereals, roots, dairy products, and live stock, including hogs and oil-bearing vegetables, for of all food shortages the most distressing world need is to-day, and will be for some time to come, of animal and vegetable fats, the lack of which has been most acutely felt with marked effect upon the health of the people in all European countries, including the neutrals, throughout practically the entire war period.

Our manifest duty, then, as business men is not only to encourage food conservation by rational living and the avoidance of waste but to encourage and help the food-producing class by lending to it our leadership, our financial support, and our business ability for organization.

#### THE CENSUS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with.

Mr. FRANCE. I object, Mr. President. I think that is a very important bill, and it should be read in full.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I will say to the Senator that I had the bill published in the RECORD day before yesterday.

Mr. FRANCE. I should not be willing to consent to the rushing through of this bill. I think it should be read very carefully. It is a most important piece of legislation. I should be opposed to anything which would be in the nature of an attempt to rush it through.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I know the Senator will acquit me of any intention or desire to rush the bill through.

Mr. FRANCE. I do acquit the Senator of that. I know that he wishes to have a clear understanding of the bill, but I merely wish to have the bill read in full.

Mr. SHEPPARD. The bill will be read for action on the committee amendments.

Mr. FRANCE. Then I will withdraw my objection, if it is to be read for action on the committee amendments. I did not understand the status.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Has the formal reading of the bill been dispensed with?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It has not. Does the Senator from Maryland withdraw his objection?

Mr. FRANCE. I do, with the understanding that the bill will be read for action on the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the formal reading of the bill is dispensed with.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that the bill may be read for action on the committee amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read for that purpose.

#### AFFAIRS IN RUSSIA.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I had intended during the course of the day to say something on the subject of our atti-

tude toward Russia and our troops in the Russian territory, but the hour is too far advanced, so I shall content myself by giving notice that when the Senate reconvenes I may have something to say upon the subject.

#### ALEXANDER F. McCOLLAM.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask leave to make a favorable report from the Committee on Public Lands on the bill (H. R. 1423) for the relief of Alexander F. McCollam, and I submit a report (No. 640) thereon. I wish to say a word in regard to the bill.

This is a bill which was favorably reported by the House Committee on Public Lands and has passed the House. It is to convey title to 1.16 acres of land in Placer County, Cal. It is in a forest reserve, but was classified as agricultural land. It was homesteaded by a homesteader who died before making the final proof. He left no widow, but his estate was administered on and closed up in the courts of California; and this little tract of land, comprising an area of 1.16 acres of land, was sold for a valuable consideration to a purchaser by order of court, and some improvements have been made upon it; and this bill is to convey title to him. The Agricultural Department recommends it, and the Interior Department has no objection to it. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. MYERS. Certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. Do I understand from the Senator that the homesteader just settled upon this 1.16 acres of land?

Mr. MYERS. So far as the record discloses, that seems to be the case.

Mr. SMOOT. What purpose did he have in mind in settling upon that little piece of land?

Mr. MYERS. He owned some land adjoining, I am told, and he simply wanted this land. I think he built a house on it. It was thrown open to homestead entry by order of the Department of Agriculture. He was intending to homestead it. Everything was done with the approval of the Department of Agriculture, so everything went nicely.

Mr. SMOOT. And he died before it was concluded?

Mr. MYERS. He died, and it was sold by the court.

Mr. SMOOT. He died before he had lived long enough to secure title?

Mr. MYERS. At least before he had made application to make final proof, and it went through the courts, and it was sold for a valuable consideration. Improvements have been put upon it, and this is just simply to straighten out the title.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It is not located in a town or near a town?

Mr. MYERS. No; the record does not disclose that at all.

Mr. SHAFROTH. It might be that there was only a fractional piece of land left, and he located upon that because of its proximity to other land.

Mr. MYERS. I think that is the case. I have read carefully the reports of the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior on the bill, and they disclose, I am told, about all that is disclosed.

Mr. SMOOT. What surprised me was that he should have located upon that 1.16 acres if he had the right to locate upon 160 acres. It rather made me suspicious that there was some real reason why he should only take this little piece of land.

Mr. MYERS. None was disclosed by the record. None appears at all.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood the Senator to say that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Secretary of the Interior both approve it.

Mr. MYERS. Yes; they do. They have looked into it thoroughly, and ask its passage.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection.

Mr. MYERS. I ask that the unfinished business may be temporarily laid aside so that this bill may be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1423) for the relief of Alexander F. McCollam, and it was read as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to issue a patent to Alexander F. McCollam, of Yankee Jims, Placer County, Cal., for the lands described in homestead entry No. 07340, Sacramento series, being homestead-entry survey No. 147, in section 28, township 14 north, range 10 east, Mount Diablo meridian, in Sacramento land district, in Placer County, Cal., and containing 1.16 acres, according to official plat of homestead-entry survey No. 147, in the Tahoe National Forest, made July 19, 1915.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.



IRA G. KILPATRICK AND GUY D. DILL.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I desire to make another report. This is on a bill in which the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] is interested. That Senator called it to my attention, and in his absence I am giving it attention for him. It is the bill (H. R. 8444) for the relief of Ira G. Kilpatrick and Guy D. Dill. I submit a report (No. 641) to accompany the bill. Its passage was recommended by the House Committee on the Public Lands and by the Interior Department. It has passed the House. This is to issue patent to 88 acres of land in Indiana upon the payment to the Government of \$1.25 per acre for it. I have read the report made in the House and the report of the Secretary of the Interior, and they set forth in brief these facts:

The land has been occupied by the owners of it and their predecessors in interest for 50 years. It is located in a thickly settled portion of Indiana, and the title has passed a number of times, and there is simply no record of any patent to it. It is one of those cases where, if a patent was ever issued, it was lost or not put on record; and the land has been for 50 years in private ownership. This is simply a piece of legislation to validate the title, and its passage is recommended by the Interior Department.

The bill has passed the House, and I send it to the desk and ask leave to make the report. I also ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8444) for the relief of Ira G. Kilpatrick and Guy D. Dill, which was read, as follows:

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the title of Ira G. Kilpatrick and Guy D. Dill, as tenants in common, in and to the west half of the southeast quarter of section 3, township 32 north, range 8 east, in the district of lands subject to sale at Fort Wayne, Ind., in Whitley County, Ind., as assigned from Jonathan Pearson, by conveyance be, and the same is hereby, quieted and confirmed, and patent therefor shall issue to the said Ira G. Kilpatrick and Guy D. Dill as tenants in common, upon payment to the United States of \$1.25 per acre.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### THE CENSUS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I ask that the unfinished business be laid again before the Senate.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 11984) to provide for the Fourteenth and subsequent decennial censuses.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, January 13, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, January 9, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Be graciously near, O God our heavenly Father, to our brave and gallant soldiers overseas. Their task having been accomplished, their hearts long for their beloved country and their dear ones at home, who are anxiously waiting their coming. Give them patience, endurance, fortitude, in the long hours they must wait; and bring them all back in safety. Especially be near to the wounded and sick, to comfort and sustain them; and Thine be the praise, through Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### THE RAILROADS.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the Record a series of four letters which passed between Judge McChord, Interstate Commerce Commissioner, and Mr. Sisson, vice president of the Guaranty Trust Co. of New York, on the question of railroad rates, management, and so forth, which I think, in view of the fact that we are soon to have railroad legislation, should be printed in the Record for the information of Members of this House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to incorporate certain letters in the Record on the subject of railroad rates. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 4240. An act for the relief of Alma Harris.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. MANN. I ask unanimous consent for leave of absence for my colleague [Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois] on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks indefinite leave of absence for his colleague [Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois] on account of illness. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### RELIEF FOR INFORMAL CONTRACTS.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the unfinished business is the contract bill.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, if necessary, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER. That is not necessary. Under the rule the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] will take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 13274) to provide relief where formal contracts have not been made in the manner required by law, with Mr. CRISP in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] has 30 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. ANTHONY] 1 hour and 30 minutes. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. ANTHONY. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SLOAN].

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, I had expected to support this measure, because I believe the Government of the United States, like every one of its honest citizens, should live up to all its obligations and not repudiate them because of mere informality under any circumstances; but I was somewhat shaken in my purpose when I found the bill to be in the form in which it has been reported, with an entire absence of information which Members of the House, in my opinion, were entitled to receive.

This bill is to validate 6,600 and more contracts, involving one and three-quarter billion dollars, and to place that power in the hands of one individual, who, by the request for this measure, has made evident the fact that of the contracts drawn 12 per cent can not pass the auditor, the proper accounting officer.

The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs said that the Secretary of War should be allowed to pass upon this matter, as he has already passed upon the remaining portion of \$15,000,000,000 of expenditure. I wonder what would take place in any well-regulated business in this country if the man in charge of that business should make the abject confession that 12 per cent of his contracts were not according to instructions or law?

But I object to this bill in its present form and shall insist upon its amendment before it shall receive my feeble support, so that the Treasury may be reasonably safeguarded.

The War Department seems to regard informality as an unpardonable sin where the amount involved is small, but almost a virtue where the amount involved is large. From the statements that have been made it is evident that it has been much easier for a man to come to Washington and obtain a million-dollar contract—so far as formality is concerned—than it has been for a soldier who has served his country in the trenches to obtain the small monthly amount which is due him. And I want to remark also—this is the main purpose for which I took the floor—that it has been easier for a more or less insolvent nation of Europe to borrow \$100,000,000 from the Treasury of the United States than it has been for a soldier, sick or wounded even unto death, to obtain the money that was justly due him for patriotic services rendered. I speak by the card as to a number of cases. So I believe that we should be careful in giving to one man the power of settling according to his sweet will this billion and three-quarters of contracts without our having any evidence whatever of what number of these 6,600 contracts, or what portion of the gross amount, were contracted 15 minutes before the armistice was agreed upon.

This bill in its present form gives all of the 11th of November to have entered into these informal contracts. It seems to me that anything like a good-faith inquiry, before the head of the